This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

SIGILLVM · R · D · IOHANNIS · ARCHIEPISCOPI · SANCTI · ANDREE

Tappan Presbyterian Association
LIBRARY.

Presented by HON. D. BETHUNE DUFFIELD.
From Library of Rev. Geo. Duffield, D.D.

Geo Duffield

Section _____
No _____

BX
917
.S13

THE Committee of the SPOTTISWOODE SOCIETY have to apologize to their Members, for the non-delivery of Vol. I. of Bishop Forbes' "CONSIDERATIONES MODESTÆ," &c. which, owing to circumstances already explained, cannot be completed for some time to come; but it is rapidly progressing, and will be delivered along with the Books for the current year.

It will be observed that "The CYPRIANIC AGE" and "The VINDICATION" are paged consecutively,—thus placing it at the option of the Subscribers to have the Work bound in either one or two Volumes.

P534]

208.52

THE

WORKS

OF THE

RIGHT REV. JOHN SAGE,

A BISHOP OF THE CHURCH IN SCOTLAND;

WITH

MEMOIR AND NOTES.

VOLUME II.

EDINBURGH:

PRINTED FOR THE SPOTTISWOODE SOCIETY.

M.DCCC.XLVI.

ALEX. LAURIE AND CO. PRINTERS TO HER MAJESTY.

THE

PRINCIPLES

OF THE

CYPRIANIC AGE,

WITH REGARD TO

EPISCOPAL POWER AND JURISDICTION,

ASSERTED AND RECOMMENDED FROM THE GENUINE WRITINGS OF ST CYPRIAN HIMSELF, AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES,

BY WHICH IT IS MADE EVIDENT THAT THE VINDICATOR OF THE KIRK OF SCOTLAND IS OBLIGED BY HIS OWN CONCESSIONS TO ACKNOWLEDGE THAT HE AND HIS ASSOCIATES ARE SCHISMATICS;

IN A LETTER TO A FRIEND.

BY

J. S.

IN THE SAVOY:

PRINTED BY EDW. JONES, FOR WALTER KETTILBY, AT THE BISHOP'S HEAD IN ST PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.

M.DC.XCV.

Dappan Pres. Assocn.
gt.
11-26-1923

EDITING COMMITTEE

OF

The Spottiswoode Society

FOR THE YEAR M.DCCC.XLVI.

THE REV. JOHN BOYLE, B.C.L., INCUMBENT OF ST MARK'S, PORTOBELLO— *Convener.*

WILLIAM FORBES, ESQ., ADVOCATE, EDINBURGH.

THE REV. FRANCIS GARDEN, M. A., INCUMBENT OF ST PAUL'S, EDINBURGH.

JOHN GORDON, ESQ., ADVOCATE, CAIRNBULG.

GEORGE PATERSON, ESQ., M.D., EDINBURGH.

CHARLES G. REID, ESQ., W. S., EDINBURGH.

CHARLES FARQUHAR SHAND, ESQ., ADVOCATE, EDINBURGH.

THE EDITOR'S PREFACE.

TO persons who hold that the *Bible*, and the Bible *only*, is the legitimate source of appeal in religious controversy, and who obstinately refuse help for arriving at truth from any other source, the labours of the learned Prelate in this work will appear valueless. But to minds ready to grasp at any thing which promises to lead them to a true knowledge of those outlines of Ecclesiastical discipline delineated in the inspired Scriptures of the New Testament, the contents of these Treatises, which profess to point out the constitution of the Christian Church in an age when it may reasonably be supposed to have preserved its original features, will be highly prized, both on account of their design, and of the qualifications of their Author to investigate the recesses of Christian antiquity.

He did not rush uncalled into the important work, but was urged to it by a particular circumstance. The bulwark of Presbyterianism in that day, Principal Rule, had rashly ventured to stake the question of "Schismatics or no Schismatics," upon the judgment of St Cyprian, and his contemporaries. Our Author, seizing the opportunity thus afforded him of

utterly demolishing the pretensions of Presbyterianism to any support from the testimony of the early Fathers, wrote his "Principles of the Cyprianic Age." The Principal attempted to repel the charge of schism from his communion, by his "Cyprianic Bishop Examined;" and Bishop Sage, in order completely to establish his position, put forth his "Vindication of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age." It is, however, only fair to state, that the "Vindication" met with an active opponent in William Jameson, Professor of History in Glasgow College, who answered it in a book, called "Cyprianus Isotimus," very able in its way; But the weight of historical evidence advanced in the "Vindication," in favour of Diocesan Episcopacy, was too great to be moved, and the work of the learned Professor serves only the purpose of shewing how little can be derived from Primitive antiquity in support of the Genevan platform.

The Editorial labours in the present publication have been expended chiefly in verifying the numerous quotations from the Fathers, and from the foreign "Reformers;" and in correcting the blunders in the Old Edition, the printing of which was not superintended by the watchful eye of the Author. The work is so complete in itself, that little room was left for the Editor to append numerous notes to it; but wherever an allusion is obscure, or a matter brought forward which other writers have handled, he has endeavoured to illustrate it, and has not failed to refer to the writer, who may have touched upon the question in hand.

With very few exceptions, the quotations have been

compared with their originals in the best editions of the various authors, and it is hoped that, in their present state, they will be found tolerably accurate.

The translations of Bishop Sage throughout the work, though often not quite literal, never fail to convey the genuine meaning of St Cyprian, or whatever other Author he may be quoting. Where they are strictly literal, they are marked with inverted commas; in other cases they are not so marked, but the reader may always compare the translation with the original, faithfully given in the notes.

The Editor cannot conclude without acknowledging his obligation to the Faculty of Advocates for the liberality of access to their noble Library, (which forms a striking contrast with the reluctance of another learned body in Edinburgh to render their Library generally useful,) and to their Sub-Librarians, the Messrs Haig, for their uniform politeness and readiness to procure for him the works, to which he wished to refer.

When the Advocates' Library failed to supply the books, by which to verify the quotations, the Editor was obliged to send the sheets to Oxford, where he incurred a debt to some of the learned Fellows of Queen's College, which he now begs gratefully to acknowledge.

EDINBURGH, JUNE 1847.

SANCTISSIMÆ MATRI ECCLESIÆ SCOTICANÆ,
SUB PONDERE PRESSÆ,
SED ET ADHUC MALIS NON CEDENTI,
FIDEM CATHOLICAM, UNITATEM APOSTOLICAM, PIETATEM PRIMÆVAM,
FORTITER PROPUGNANTI ;

ADVERSUS BLASPHEMIAS, CALUMNIAS, SACRILEGIA, ET RUINAS,
INVICTO (QUIA VERE CHRISTIANO) ANIMO
STRENUE DECERTANTI ;

CULTU, FIDE, ET JUSTITIA,
IN DEUM, REGEM, ET PROXIMOS,
CONSPICUÆ ;

HÆRESES OMNES, TAM ANTIQUAS QUAM NOVAS,
ARMIS EVANGELICIS ET PERPETUA ECCLESIÆ TRADITIONE,
PROFLIGANTI ;

UNDIQUE LACHRYMIS SUFFUSÆ,
VICTRICE TAMEN CRUCE TRIUMPHANTI ;
(TAM ARCHIEPISCOPIS, EPISCOPIS, PRESBYTERIS, ET DIACONIS,
QUAM UNIVERSO FIDELIUM CŒTUI,
VERIS SUIS PASTORIBUS VINCULO ἑνωτικῷ PRIMIGENIÆ
ADHÆRESCENTI)

SOLA SPE CŒLESTIS PRÆMII, INTER CLADES MISERAS ET MAXIMAS,
SUFFULTÆ ;

HANC DISSERTATIONEM EPISTOLAREM (RAPTIM ET SERMONE
VERNACULO CONSCRIPTAM) DE EPISCOPORUM ÆVI CYPRIANICI
EMINENTIA ET PRÆROGATIVIS,
EA QUA PAR EST ANIMI MODESTIA ET REVERENTIA,
CLIENTELÆ ET CENSURÆ ERGO,
D. D. D.

THE

PRINCIPLES

OF THE

CYPRIANIC AGE, &c.

SIR,

I ACKNOWLEDGE you have performed your promise.[1] The Author[2] of "The Defence of the Vindication of the Church of Scotland, in Answer to an Apology of" (he should have said for) "the Clergy of Scotland," has indeed said so as you affirmed: And I ask your pardon for putting you to the trouble of sending me his book, and pointing to sect. 39, page 34, where he has said so. But now, after all, what though he has said so? and said so, so boldly? Do you think his bare saying so is enough to determine our question? Don't mistake it. That which made me so backward to believe he had said so, was not

[1] [This work opens very abruptly; but by referring to the "Vindication," chap. 1, sec. 60, the reader will perceive the reasons given by the Author for this abruptness, and will meet with much interesting matter relating to the present treatise.—E.]

[2] [This was Gilbert Rule, eminent among the Presbyterians for his learning, and known to Episcopalians from the severe castigations which he received at the hands of Bishop Sage.—See Memoir of the Life and Times of the Right Rev. Bishop Sage, prefixed to the Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, p. 50, note 1.—E.]

any dreadful apprehension I had of either his reason or authority; but a persuasion that none of his party would have been so rash as to have put their being, or not being, schismaticks, upon such a desperate issue. And that you may not apprehend my persuasion was unreasonable, I shall first take to task what he hath said; and then, perchance, add something concerning our main argument. His words are these:—

Arg. 5. "Cyprian's notion of schism is—When one separateth from his own Bishop. This the Presbyterians do: Ergo. *A.* All the strength of this argument lieth in the sound of words. A Bishop, in Cyprian's time, was not a diocesan, with sole power of jurisdiction and ordination. If he prove that, we shall give Cyprian and him leave to call us schismaticks. A Bishop, then, was the pastor of a flock, or the moderator of a Presbytery. If he can prove that we separate from our Pastors, or from the Presbytery with their Moderator, under whose inspection we ought to be, let him call us what he will: But we disown the Bishops in Scotland from being our Bishops; we can neither own their Episcopal authority, nor any pastoral relation that they have to us." Thus he.

Now, Sir, if one had a mind to catch at words, what a field might he have here? For instance—Suppose the word Diocese was not in use in St Cyprian's time, as applied to a particular Bishop's district, doth it follow, that the thing now signified by it was not then to be found? Again, What could move him to insinuate, that we assign the sole power of jurisdiction and ordination to our Diocesan Bishop? When did our Bishops claim that sole power? When was it ascribed to them by the Constitution? When did any of our Bishops attempt to exercise it! When did a Scotish Bishop offer, *e. g.* to ordain or depose a Presbyter,[1] without

[1] [It is the usage of the Scottish Church that at the ordination of a priest or presbyter, those of the same order who happen to be present lay on hands conjointly with the Bishop, through whom all authority really flows; and when either a priest or a deacon is accused of any charge, it is appointed by the canons of the Scottish Episcopal Church

the concurrence of other Presbyters? When was such a sole power deem'd necessary for raising a Bishop to all the due elevations of the Episcopal authority? How easie is it to distinguish between a sole and a chief power? Between a power superiour to all other powers, and a power exclusive of all other powers? Between a power, without, or against which, no other powers can act; though they may, in conjunction with it, or subordination to it: And a power, destroying all other powers, or disabling them from acting? Once more, How loose and ambiguous is that part of his definition of a Bishop, in St Cyprian's time, in which he calls him—"The Pastor of a flock?" May not a Bishop and his Diocese be called a Pastor and a flock, in as great propriety of speech, as a Presbyterian Minister and his parish? Sure I am, St Cyprian and his contemporaries thought so, as you may learn hereafter.

How easie were it, I say, for one to insist on such escapes, if he had a mind for it? but I love not jangle; and I must avoid prolixity: And therefore, considering the state of the controversie between our author and the apologist, and supposing he intended (however he expressed it) to speak home to the apologist's argument, the force and purpose of his answer, as I take it, must be this.

"That an argument drawn from such as were called Bishops in St Cyprian's time, to such as are *now* so called in Scotland, is not good. That a Bishop in St Cyprian's time was nothing like one of our modern Bishops, *i. e.* a Church Governour superiour to, and having a Prelatick power over, all other Church Governours within such a district as we commonly call a diocese; that a Bishop then was no more than a single presbyter, or pastor of a single flock, (such a flock as could conveniently meet together in one assembly, for the publick offices of religion; such a flock as the people of one single parish are, in the modern presbyterian notion of a parish,) acting in parity with other single pastors of other single flocks or parishes. Or, at most, that he was but the Moderator of a Presbytery,

that the Bishop shall not proceed to pronounce sentence until he has received the opinion of each member of the Diocesan Synod.—*Vide* Canon 36.—E.]

taking both terms in the modern current Presbyterian sense; *i. e.* as Moderator signifies one, who, as such, is no Church Governour, nor hath any jurisdiction over his brethren: One whose power is merely ordinative not decisive; to be the mouth of the meeting, not to be their will or commanding faculty; to keep order in the manner and managing of what cometh before them; not to determine what is debated amongst them. And as Presbytery signifies such a number of teaching and ruling presbyters living and having their cures within such a district, meeting together upon occasion, and acting in parity in the adminstration of the government, and discipline of the Church; that therefore our Scotish presbyterians cannot be called Schismaticks in St Cyprian's notion of schism, unless it can be proved, that they separate from their pastor, or teaching presbyter, who has such a parish assigned to him for his charge; or, (not from the Moderator of the Presbytery, who is not, but) from the Presbytery (which is the principle of unity) with their Moderator."

This, I say, I take to be the purpose of our author's answer to the apologist's argument; on the force whereof he ventures his parties being, or not being, Schismaticks. If I have mistaken his meaning, I protest I have not done it wilfully. I am pretty sure I have not in the definition of a Moderator; for I have transcribed it, word for word, from one whom I take to be a dear friend of his, entirely of the same principles and sentiments with him; and whose definitions, I am apt to think, he will not readily reject. I mean the author of "The Vindication[1] of the Church of

[1] [Gilbert Rule, who, from his pamphleteering notoriety, was styled the "Vindicator of the Kirk." The author of the "Ten Questions," undertakes to prove that the Presbyterian Government was not settled by law for many years after the reformed religion had been established in Scotland; and that it never was settled in Scotland without restraint from tumultuous times; and that even at the period of the Revolution, it was very far from agreeable to the *inclinations of the people*—the basis upon which it professed to be erected. He undertakes also to show that the principles of the Presbyterians allowed no liberty of conscience to those who dissented from them, and that they were utterly destructive of the legal monarchy of the kingdom. He further demonstrates that the penal laws in Scotland, against the Presbyterians, during the reign of Charles II. had nothing of persecution in them, and fully vindicates the Episcopal

Scotland, in Answer to the Ten Questions."[1] And doth not our author himself, in this same 39th section, (part whereof I am now considering), affirm, That " fifty years before the first Council of Nice, (*i. e.* some seventeen or eighteen years after St Cyprian's martyrdom), the Hierarchy was not in the Church? And that however some of the names might have been, yet the Church power and dominion, signified by them, was not then in being?" Plainly importing, that the Church then was governed by Pastors acting in *parity*, after the Presbyterian model. In short, what our author hath said, when duly considered, will be found to be no answer at all to the Apologist's argument, if it is not to be understood in the sense I have represented.

Taking it for granted, therefore, that I have hit his meaning, I hope you will not deny, that—if I shall prove that a Bishop, in Cyprian's time, was more than a pastor of a flock, or the Moderator of a Presbytery, in the Presbyterian sense of the terms—if I shall prove that a Bishop then had really that which cannot be denied to have been true, genuine Episcopal or Prelatick power—if I can prove that he acted in a *real superiority* over, not in *parity* with, other church governours, even pastors—if I shall prove these things, I say, I hope you'l grant our author is fairly bound, by his word, to acknowledge that he and his Brethren *Presbyterians* are *schismaticks*. Let us try it then: And now, Sir,

Before I come to my main proofs, consider if it may not be deemed a shrewd presumption against our author in this matter, that generally the great champions for Presbytery, such as Chamier,[2] Blondel, Salmasius, the Provincial Assembly of London, &c. do ingenuously acknowledge, that long

Clergy of the day from being concerned in the sufferings of which the Covenanters so grievously complained, but which they brought upon themselves by open rebellion and avowed anarchy. The " Ten Questions" is a valuable pamphlet, and contains an ample refutation of the aspersions which are even at this day heaped upon the Church in Scotland.—E.]

[1] Ad Quest. 1, Sect. 5.

[2] [Besides his eminence among Protestants as a Divine, Daniel Chamier was so famous as a Politician, that he was entrusted with the important task of drawing up the Edict of Nantes, promulgated in 1598 by Henry IV. for the relief of his Protestant subjects.—E.]

before St Cyprian's time, Episcopacy was in the Church; even Spanhemius himself grants, that, in the third century, "Bishops had a preeminence above Presbyters and Deacons, and a right of presiding, convocating, ordaining,[1]" &c. by the way, I have cited this writer particularly, because our author not only builds much on his authority,[2] but honours him with the great character of being that diligent searcher into antiquity. How deservedly, let others judge; for my part, I cannot think he has been so very diligent a searcher; for in that very same section, in which he acknowledges the Episcopal preeminence in the third century, he says expressly, that in that age there were no door-keepers, acolyths, nor exorcists.[3] And yet I not only find express mention of exorcism, in the venerable Council of Carthage, in which St Cyprian was præses,[4] but both Cyprian and Firmilian expressly mention Exorcists.[5] And as for Acolyths, how often do we find them mentioned in Cyprian's Epistles? *e. g.* we have Naricus an Acolyth, Ep. 7. Favorinus, Ep. 34. Nicephorus, Ep. 45. Saturus and Felicianus, Ep. 59. Lucanus, Maximus, and Amantius, Ep. 77. And doth not Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, in his famous Epistle to Fabius, Bishop of Antioch, recorded by Eusebius,[6] positively affirm, that there were then in the Church of Rome, 42 Acloyths, and 52 Exorcists, lectors, and door-keepers? but this, as I have said, only by the way.

That which I am concerned about at present is, that when these great patrons of Presbytery, these truly learned men, whom I named, have all so frankly yielded that there was real prelacy in the Church in, and before St Cyprian's time, yet our author should affirm so boldly, that there was no such thing; that there was no hierarchy in the

[1] Episcoporum manifesta ubique πρεσταξίᾳ seu jure præsidendi, convocandi, ordinandi, &c. Epit. Isag. ad Hist. Eccles. Nov. Test. Sæc. 3, Sect. 6, page mihi, 117. [Compend. Introd. ad Hist. Eccles. Nov. Test. sæc. 3, sect. 6, p. 81. Ed. Lugd. Batav. 1694.—E.]

[2] Sect. 32, p. 28.

[3] Sed nec hujus ævi Ordines Minores, quales Ostiariorum, Copiatarum, Acolythorum, Exorcistarum, p. 119. Ibid. sect. 6, p. 82.—E.]

[4] Suffrag. 1, 8, 31, 37.

[5] Ep. 23, p. 49. Ep. 69, p. 187. Ep. 75, p. 223.

[6] Hist. Eccl. lib. vi. cap. 43.—[Hist. Eccles. lib. vi. cap. 35, Ed. Col. Allob.—E.]

Church then, nor for many years after. Has our author been a more diligent searcher into antiquity than those great antiquaries were, that he was thus able to contradict their discoveries? I am not apt to believe it. However, as I said, let this pass only for a presumption against him. I proceed to other arguments. And,

1. I observe that, in St Cyprian's time, every Church, all the world over, at least every Church constituted and organized according to the principles which then prevailed, had a Bishop, Presbyters, and Deacons, by whom she was ruled.

Thus, for example, we find express mention of the Bishop, Presbyters, and Deacons, of the Church of Adrymetum;[1] for Cyprian tells Cornelius—"That when he and Liberalis came to that city, Polycarpus, the Bishop, was absent, and the Presbyters and Deacons were ignorant of what had been resolved on by the body of the African Bishops about writing to the Church of Rome, till the controversie between Cornelius and Novatianus[2] should be more fully understood."

Thus Cyprian was Bishop of Carthage, and at the same time there were, in that city, eight Presbyters at fewest: For we read of three, Rogatianus, Britius, and Numidicus, who adhered to him,[3] and five who took part with Felicissimus against him, when that Deacon made his schism.[4] I hope I need not be at pains to prove that there were Deacons then in that famous Church.

Thus Cornelius, in the afore-mentioned Epistle to Fabius, tells him—"That while himself was Bishop of Rome, there

[1] Presbyteri et Diaconi in Adrumetina consistentes, Polycarpo co-episcopo nostro absente, ignorabant quid nobis in commune placuisset, &c. Ep. 48, p. 91.

[2] [Novatian, a Roman presbyter, held that the Church had no power to remit post-baptismal crimes. He was opposed in this opinion by his co-presbyters, and particularly by Cornelius, who, for his eminent learning and piety, was elected to the Papal chair upon the death of Fabianus, A. D. 250. Novatian, upon this, withdrew himself from the jurisdiction of Cornelius, and was excommunicated by a Provincial Council. After his excommunication he set up a new sect, of which he became Bishop. The fiercest among his partisans was Novatus, a Carthaginian presbyter, who, being excommunicated by St Cyprian, had taken up his abode at Rome. —E.]

[3] Ep. 43.

[4] Ep. 59.

were in that city no fewer than forty-six Presbyters and seven Deacons," &c. "A most flourishing clergy," as St Cyprian calls it.[1] Whoso pleases may see the like account of the Church of Alexandria, in the same times, in Eusebius.[2]

Indeed, if we may believe St Cyprian, there was no Church then without a Bishop. For from this supposition, as an uncontroverted matter of fact, he reasons against Novatianus.[3] His argument is—That there is but *one Church and one Episcopacy, all the world over;* and that Catholick and orthodox Bishops were regularly planted in every province and city, and therefore Novatianus could not but be a schismatick, who, contrary to Divine institution, and the fundamental laws of unity, laboured to superinduce false Bishops into these cities, where true and orthodox Bishops were already planted. And he reasons again upon the same supposition, in the beginning of his 63d Epistle directed to Cæcilius, concerning the cup in the Eucharist.[4] From this supposition, I say, as from an uncontested matter of fact, he reasons, in both cases which is a demonstration, not only of the credibility of his testimony, but that the matter of fact was then so notorious, as to be undeniable. He reason'd from it, as from an acknowledged postulate.

2. I observe, that the Presbyters, who, in these times, were contra-distinguished from the Bishop and Deacons, were Priests, in the language which was then current; pastors, in the present Presbyterian dialect, *i. e.* not ruling Elders, but such as laboured in the Word and Sacraments. They were

[1] Ep. 59, p. 139.

[2] Hist. Eccles. lib. vii. cap. 11.

[3] Cum sit, a Christo, una Ecclesia, per totum mundum, in multa membra divisa, item Episcopatus unus Episcoporum multorum concordi numerositate diffusus, ille post Dei traditionem, post connexam et ubique conjunctam Catholicæ Ecclesiæ unitatem, humanam conetur Ecclesiam facere, et per plurimas civitates novos Apostolos suos mittat, ut quædam recentia institutionis suæ fundamenta constituat, cumque jampridem per OMNES PROVINCIAS et per URBES SINGULAS, ordinati sint Episcopi in ætate antiqui, in fide integri, in pressura probati, in persecutione proscripti, ille super eos creare alios pseudo-episcopos audeat. Ep. 55, p. 112.

[4] Quanquam sciam, frater carissime, Episcopos plurimos Ecclesiis Dominicis in TOTO MUNDO divina dignatione præpositos, &c. Ep. 63, ab initio.

such as were honoured with the Divine Priesthood; such as were constituted in the clerical ministry; such as whose work it was to attend the altar and the sacrifices, and offer up the publick prayers, &c. as we find in the instance of Geminius and Faustinus.[1] Such as God, in his merciful providence, was pleased to raise to the glorious station of the Priesthood, as in the case of Numidicus.[2] Such as in the time of persecution went to the prisons, and gave the Holy Eucharist to the confessors.[3] Such as at Carthage (as St Cyprian complains to Cornelius) presumed to curtail the penances of the Lapsers, and gave them the Holy Sacrament, while their idolatry was so very recent, that, as it were, their hands and mouths were still a smoaking with the warm nidors of the sacrifices that had been offered upon the devil's altars.[4] Such as, contrary to all rule and order, absolved the lapsers, and gave them the communion without the Bishops' licence.[5] Such as were joined with the Bishop in the sacerdotal honour.[6] In a word, they were such Presbyters as St Cyprian describes to Stephen, Bishop of Rome. Such as sometimes raised altar against altar, and (out of the communion with the Church) offered false and sacrilegious sacrifices. Such as were to be deposed when they did so. Such as, though they should return to the communion of the Church, were only to be admitted to *Lay-Communion*, and not to be allowed thereafter to act as men in holy orders; seeing it became the *Priests* and Ministers of God, those who attend the altar and sacrifices, to be men of integrity, and blameless.[7] Such Presbyters they were, I say, who were then

[1] Divino sacerdotio honorati, et in clericis ministeriis constituti, non nisi altari et sacrificiis deservire, et precibus atque orationibus vacare debeant. Ep. 1, p. 1.

[2] Ut eum Clero nostro Dominus adjungeret, et desolatam per lapsum quorundam Presbyterii nostri [presbyterorum nostrorum Ed. Balutz Benedict.] copiam gloriosis Sacerdotibus adornaret. Ep. 40, p. 79.

[3] Ep. 5, p. 11.

[4] Ep. 59, p. 134, et De Lapsis, p. 128.

[5] Ep. 15, 16, 17, fuse. [6] Ep. 61, p. 145.

[7] Addimus plane et adjungimus, Frater carissime consensu et auctoritate communi, ut etiam si qui Presbyteri—contra altare unum atque divinum, sacrificia foris, falsa et sacrilega offerre conati sint, eos quoque

contra-distinguished from the Bishop: For, as for your *lay elders*, your *ruling*, contra-distinct from *teaching* Presbyters,[1] now so much in vogue; there is as profound a

hac conditione suscipi cum revertuntur, ut COMMUNICENT LAICI—Nec debere eos revertentes ea apud nos ordinationis et honoris arma retinere, quibus contra nos rebellaverunt: Oportet enim SACERDOTES—qui altari et sacrificiis deserviunt, integros atque immaculatos esse, &c. Ep. 72, p. 197.

[1] ["In the Presbyterian Church, the government and discipline in each congregation is committed to a bench of Elders, consisting of eight or ten of the most pious, enlightened, wise, prudent and grave members of the church. They constitute, with the pastor at their head, a judicial body, who maintain an official inspection over the members of the church, and deliberately sit in judgment on all those delicate and momentous cases, which are connected with receiving, admonishing, and rebuking, suspending, excommunicating, and dismissing the members of the flock committed to their care."—Manual of Presbytery, by Samuel Miller, D. D. Ed. Lorimer, Edin. 1842. Upon this point, I cannot do better than quote from a note in the Appendix to the present Bishop of Glasgow's excellent sermon on the Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy, in which the unfounded claims to divine authority for these officers of the Kirk are ably overturned. The learned prelate observes at p. 52, (3d Edition)—

"I have said that in no part of the New Testament does presbyter denote a layman invested with a subordinate species of ecclesiastical authority. Of course, no one can be ignorant of the celebrated text in the first Epistle to Timothy v. 17, "Let the presbyters that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine." From this passage it has been inferred that there must have been in the primitive Church two classes of presbyters, of whom the one presided in the assemblies of the faithful, and the other taught. The former are described as *οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες*, "qui bene presunt," according to the versions of Erasmus and Beza; "qui bene sese gerunt," according to Tremellius; and "qui bene præsident," according to others. The literal meaning is, that those who preside in a becoming manner should be held worthy of a double allowance from the store collected for the maintenance of the church; but it is added, "especially those who labour in the word and doctrine." Hence the question, which, since the days of Calvin, has been so much agitated by those who oppose, and by those who approve his system of lay or *ruling* presbyters, as distinguished from the *preaching* or clerical presbyters. The school of Geneva felt secure in asserting from the words of St Paul, "Hinc constat, duo tunc fuisse Presbyterorum genera, quorum uni gubernationi vacabant, alteri sermoni; neque enim omnes ad docendum ordinabantur." To others this conclusion does not seem quite so evident, and hence they argue that the apostle "distinguit hic non duos ordines, sed diversa ejusdem ordinis officia et merita." The one maintains that the inspired writer describes two distinct *orders* of presbyters; the other holds that the description applies to the several *duties and offices* of the same order.

"To me it seems manifest that the order of presbyters is one, and that

silence of them in St Cyprian's Works and time, as there is of the Solemn League and Covenant, or The Sanquhar

only the functions or qualifications are different. Suppose there are two orders, and that the apostolical injunction must be read as follows :—Let the lay presbyters who preside well be counted worthy of a double maintenance, especially the clerical presbyters who labour in the word and doctrine. Is this sense? Take the words on the other supposition, namely, that there is but one order of presbyters, and that the duties only are various, and then we may read, Let the presbyters who preside in a becoming manner be counted worthy of a double share of income, especially those who (besides ruling well) devote themselves to the propagation of the gospel and the instruction of their people. This view is at least more intelligible.

"It was not till the sixteenth century that this famous text was understood to afford any authority for lay presbyters as a standing order in the christian church. When Calvin's notion was first started, it puzzled many persons of great judgment and learning, who saw not at once how the distinction maintained by him between a presiding and a teaching presbyter could be rejected or his reasoning refuted. Archbishop Whitgift, for example, in his controversy with Cartwright, yielded the point in debate, and acknowledged that in the primitive church they had in every congregation certain elders to whom the government of it was committed :—"A gross mistake," says Bilson, "into which that learned prelate allowed himself to fall, from not consulting with sufficient care the opinions of the ancient commentators."

"It is not indeed possible," continues Bilson, "to determine with accuracy and confidence in this matter, without having recourse to the fathers of the church, and ascertaining what was the practice of the Christian world in the times nearest those of the Apostles. If we look into the Epistles of Ignatius, who lived in the Apostles' days, who was made Bishop of Antioch by them, and who suffered martyrdom not long after the time of St John, we shall find him frequently enjoining obedience to the bishops, priests, and deacons, but not one word of any ruling elders. In the subsequent fathers we find the same. So also if we look into the canons called Apostolical, which were enacted in the several councils held during the three first centuries, we shall there find that no class of men had then any rule in the church besides the three orders just mentioned. Let us examine the discipline and government of all the churches from their very foundation down to Calvin's days, and we shall not find among them any traces of a ruling elder. From this unanimity in point of opinion, and this agreement in point of practice, we may most confidently conclude that Calvin and his followers have given a wrong exposition of St Paul's words as addressed to Timothy. Had the institution of ruling elders, in the modern sense of the phrase, been received in the church, it is next to impossible but there must have been some mention made of them, at some time or place, in the long course of fifteen hundred years. An apostolical injunction could not have been thrown aside by all the churches in the world, without leaving some trace of it in history or the records of councils."

Declaration: And yet, considering how much he has left upon record about the governours, the government, and the discipline of the Church, if there had been such Presbyters *then*, it is next to a miracle that he should not, so much as once, have mentioned them.

3. I observe, that the Bishop's power, his authority, his pastoral relation—call it as you will—extended to all the Christians within his district; *e. g.* Cornelius was immediately and directly Superior to all the Christians in Rome, and they were his subjects. So it was also with Fabius and the Christians of Antioch, Dionysius and the Christians of Alexandria, Cyprian and the Christians of Carthage, &c. The Bishop's prelation, whatever it was, related not solely

" He again recurs to his argument, and remarks, that if this (the conclusion of Calvin) " were the true meaning of St Paul's advice, and that it applied, in fact, to two distinct orders of presbyters, some traces of this institution would appear in the writings of the ancients. It would be strange, if lay elders everywhere governed the church under the Apostles, that no council, no history, no father did ever so much as name them, or remember them, or so much as conceive the words or meaning of St Paul until the days of Calvin."—" The first reason I have of the weakness of this place to uphold the lay elders is, that many learned and ancient fathers have debated and sifted the force of these words, and not one of them ever so much as surmised any such thing to be contained in this text. Chrysostom, Jerome, Ambrose, Theodoret, Primasius, Œcumenius, Theophylact, and divers others, have considered and expounded these words, and never dreamed of any lay presbytery to be mentioned in them. If, then, the words of St Paul stood fair and clear without this late device, as in the judgment of these learned and ancient writers they do, what reason after fifteen hundred years to entertain a new platform of governing the church by laymen, upon a bare conceit that the words of St Paul may sound to that effect as some imagine."

" Having given his reason for not coming into this new interpretation of the text, he shews us in what manner Chrysostom and other writers of primitive times were wont to understand it, namely, " that whereas in a minister of the word, good life, good government, and good doctrine are required; the two first are commended, but painfulness in the word is chiefly to be preferred in men of their calling; and so, not two sorts of presbyters but two parts of the pastoral office and function are implied in these words."—Bilson's Perpetual Government of Christ's Church, Preface. Brett's Tradition necessary to interpret and explain the Holy Scriptures, p. 91.

The reader may, from this elaborate note, derive a fair specimen of the sermon to which it is appended, which, within a small compass, and in the usual elegant and simple style of the writer, condenses the various arguments for Episcopacy and the apostolical succession.—E.]

to the clergy, or solely to the laity, but to both, equally and formally. How fully might this point be proved, if it were needful? Indeed, St Cyprian defines a Church to be "A people united to their Priest," and "A flock adhering to their Pastor." And that by the terms Priest and Pastor, he meant the Bishop, is plain from what immediately follows, for he tells Florentius Pupianus there—"That from that common and received notion of a Church, he ought to have learned, that the Bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the Bishop; and that whoso is not with the Bishop is not in the Church."[1] And in that same Epistle, chastising the same Florentius for calling his title to his Bishoprick in question, and speaking bitter things against him, he reasons thus—"What swelling of pride? What arrogance of spirit? What haughtiness is this? That thou shouldst arraign Bishops before thy tribunal? and unless we be purged by thee, and absolved by thy sentence, lo! these six years, the *Brotherhood* has had no *Bishop;* the *People* no *Ruler;* the *Flock* no *Pastor;* the *Church* no *Governour;* *Christ* no *Prelate;* and *God* no *Priest?*"[2] In short, he that bore the high character of Bishop, in St Cyprian's time, was called the Ruler of the Church by way of eminence.[3] The Church was compared to a ship, and the Bishop was the master.[4] He was the father, and all the christians within his district were his children.[5] He was the governor,[6] the rector,[7] the captain,[8]

[1] Christo sunt Ecclesia plebs Sacerdoti adunata, et pastori suo grex adhærens. Unde scire debes Episcopum in Ecclesia esse, et Ecclesiam in Episcopo, et si qui cum Episcopo non sint, in Ecclesia non esse. Ep. 66, p. 168.

[2] Quis enim hic est superbiæ tumor? Quæ arrogantia animi? Quæ mentis inflatio? Ad cognitionem suam, præpositos et Sacerdotes vocare? Ac nisi apud te purgati fuerimus et sententia tua absoluti, ecce jam sex annis nec fraternitas habuerit Episcopum, nec plebs præpositum, nec grex pastorem, nec Ecclesia gubernatorem, nec Christus Antistitem, nec Deus Sacerdotem? Ibid. p. 167.

[3] Præpositus, *passim.*

[4] Christi adversarius, et Ecclesiæ ejus inimicus; ad hoc Ecclesiæ præpositum sua infestatione prosequitur, ut gubernatore sublato, atrocius atque violentius circa Ecclesiæ naufragia grassetur. Ep. 59, p. 130. *Vide* etiam, Ep. 30, p. 56.

[5] Ep. 41, p. 79.

[6] Gubernator, *passim.*

[7] Rector, Ep. 59, p. 133.

[8] Dux, Ep. 60, p. 141.

the head,[1] the judge,[2] of all within his diocese. He was the chief pastor; and though Presbyters were also sometimes called pastors, yet it was but seldom; and, at best, they were but such in subordination. Indeed, the Presbyters of the Church of Rome, during the vacancy between Fabianus his death, and Cornelius his promotion, look'd only on themselves as vice-pastors, saying, that in such a juncture, they kept the flock *instead* of the pastor, the Bishop.[3] I could give you even a surfeit of evidences, I say, for the truth of this proposition, if it were needful. Whoso reads St Cyprian's Epistles, may find it in almost every page. And I shall have occasion hereafter to insist on many arguments in the probation of other things, which may further clear this also. Indeed, there is no more in all this than Ignatius said frequently, near one hundred and fifty years before St Cyprian.[4]

And now, Sir, though the monuments of the Cyprianic age could afford us no more than these three things which I have proved from them, they would be of sufficient force to overthrow our author's definition of a Bishop in St Cyprian's time, as to both parts of it, and demonstrate to every thinking man's conviction, that he was neither the "Pastor of the Flock," nor "The Moderator of a Presbytery," in our author's sense of the terms.

1. Not the Pastor of a Flock, *i. e.* a single Presbyter, having the charge of a single parish after the Presbyterian model: For a Bishop, in those times, had many such Presbyters under him. Cyprian himself (whatever he had more) had no fewer than eight under him in the city of Carthage, besides the adjacent villages. Cornelius was over forty-six in the city of Rome. I know not how many Dionysius was over at Alexandria, or Polycarpus at Adrumetum; but it is certain they were in the plural number. So it was all

[1] Caput, Ep. 45, p. 86. [2] Judex, Ep. 59, p. 129.

[3] Et cum incumbat nobis qui videmur præpositi esse, et VICE PASTORIS custodire gregem, &c. Ep. 8, p. 16.

[4] Ὅπου ἂν φανῇ ὁ Ἐπίσκοπος ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔστω. Ignat. ad Smyrn. Edit. Lond. 1680, p. 6. [Ed. Oxon. 1709, p. 4.—E.] χωρὶς τούτων (Episcopo nempe, Presbyteris et Diaconis,) Ἐκκλησία οὐ καλεῖται Ad Trall. p. 48, et *passim*.—[Ibid, pp. 32, 33.—E.]

the Christian world over, as I have proved. A Bishop, then, in St Cyprian's time, was a Pastor indeed, but it was of a Diocese; *i. e.* all the Christians within such a district were his flock; and he had a direct, formal, and immediate pastoral relation to them all, though, at the same time, within the same district, there were many inferior Pastors, who were subordinate and subject to him.

2. He was as little a mere Moderator of a Presbytery, in our author's sense of the terms. A Presbyterian Moderator, as such, is no church governour at all: A Bishop, in St Cyprian's time, as such, was chief pastor, judge, head, master, rector, governour, of all the Christians within his district. A Presbyterian Moderator, as such, has no direct, immediate, formal relation to the people, but only to the Presbytery. He is the mouth, and keeps order in the manner and managing of the affairs of the Presbytery, not of the church, or rather churches, within the bounds of that Presbytery. But a Bishop, in St Cyprian's time, was quite another thing: his Prelacy, whatever it was, related to the laity, as well as to the clergy. St Cyprian's, *e. g.* to as many Christians as required the subordinate labours of at least eight presbyters: Cornelius's to as many as required the subordinate labours of forty-six: To a body of Christians, in which, besides forty-six presbyters, seven deacons, seven sub-deacons, forty-two acolyths, fifty-two exorcists, lectors, and door-keepers, there were more than fifteen hundred widows and poor people who subsisted by charity: and, besides all these, a mighty and innumerable laity, as himself words it.[1] These things, I say, might be sufficient in all reason to confute our author's notion. But then, this is not all, for let us consider,

II. How a Bishop, in St Cyprian's time, was promoted to his chair, to that sublime top of the Priesthood (as he calls it).[2] And we shall easily collect another demonstration against our author's notion. For, by the principles of those times, it was plain,

[1] *Μετὰ μιγίστου καὶ ἀναριθμήτου λαοῦ,* apud Euseb. H. E. lib. 6, cap. 35. —[Ed. Col. Allob.—E.]

[2] Sacerdotii sublime fastigium. Ep. 55, p. 103.

1. That there could be no lawful nor allowable promotion of one to a Bishoprick which had been possessed before, unless there was a clear, canonical, and unquestionable vacancy. It was a received maxim then, that there could be but one Bishop at once in a Church. When a See was once canonically filled, whosoever else pretended to be Bishop of that See, was not a *second* Bishop, but *none at all*, in St Cyprian's judgment.[1] Nay, he was so far from reckoning of him as another Bishop, that he deemed him not a christian.[2] Innumerable are his testimonies to this purpose.[3] But I shall transcribe only one from Ep. 69, because he fully reasons the case in it. "There was a controversie between Cornelius and Novatianus, whether was Bishop of Rome." Now consider how St Cyprian decides it. "The Church is one" (says he); "and this one Church cannot be both within and without: If, therefore, the true Church is with Novatianus, she was not with Cornelius; but if she was with Cornelius, who succeeded to Bishop Fabianus by lawful ordination, and whom God honoured with martyrdom, as well as with the Episcopal dignity, Novatianus is not in the Church; nor can he be acknowledged as a Bishop, who, contemning the evangelical and apostolical tradition, and succeeding to none, hath sprung from himself. He can by no means either have or hold a church, who is not ordained in the Church; for the Church cannot be without herself, nor divided against herself," &c. And a little after, "our Lord recommending to us the unity which is of divine institution, saith, 'I and my Father are one;' and again, obliging the Church to keep this unity, he saith, 'there shall be one flock, and one pastor;' but if the flock is one, how can he be reputed to be of the flock who is not numbered with the flock? Or how can he be deem'd a pastor, who (while the True Pastor lives and rules the flock

[1] Et cum post primum secundus esse non possit, quisquis post unum, qui solus esse debeat, factus est, non jam secundus, ille sed nullus est. Ep. 55, p. 104.

[2] Quisquis ille est et qualiscunque est; Christianus non est. Ep. 55, p. 112, fase.

[3] Ep. 44, p. 86. Ep. 45, p. 86. Ep. 46, p. 89. Ep. 59, p. 130. Ep. 61, p. 144. Ep. 68, p. 177. Ep. 69, p. 184. De Unit. Eccl. p. 110.

by a succedaneous ordination) succeeds to none, but begins from himself? Such an one is an alien, is profane, is an enemy to Christian peace and unity. He dwells not in the House of God, *i. e.* in the Church of God: None can dwell there but the sons of concord and unanimity."[1]

Neither was this principle peculiar to St Cyprian: Cornelius, in his so often mentioned Epistle to Fabius, insists on it also, and in a manner ridicules Novatianus, if not for his ignorance of it, at least for entertaining the vain conceit, that it was in his power to counteract it.[2] And when Maximus, Urbanus, Sidonus, Macarius, &c. deserted Novatianus, and returned to Cornelius his communion, they made a solemn confession, that, upon the score of that same common maxim, they ought to have looked upon Novatianus as a false and schismatical Bishop. "We know," say they, "that Cornelius was chosen Bishop of the most holy Catholick Church by the Omnipotent God and our Lord Jesus Christ. We confess our error—we were imposed upon—we were circumvented by perfidy and ensnaring sophistry;—— for we are not ignorant that there is one God, one Christ our Lord, whom we have confessed, one Holy Ghost; and that there ought to be but one Bishop in a Catholick Church."[3]

[1] Ecclesia enim una est, quæ una et intus esse et foris non potest. Si enim apud Novatianum est, apud Cornelium non fuit. Si vero apud Cornelium fuit, qui Fabiano Episcopo legitima ordinatione successit, et quem præter Sacerdotii honorem martyrio quoque Dominus glorificavit, Novatianus in Ecclesia non est, nec Episcopus computari potest, qui evangelica et apostolica traditione contempta, nemini succedens, a seipso ortus est: habere namque aut tenere Ecclesiam nullo modo potest qui ordinatus in Ecclesia non est: foris enim non esse Ecclesiam, nec scindi adversum se aut dividi posse, &c. Et paulo post—Idcirco Dominus insinuans nobis unitatem de Divina auctoritate venientem, ponit et dicit: *Ego et Pater unum sumus:* Ad quam unitatem redigens Ecclesiam suam, denuo dicit: *et erit unus grex, et unus Pastor.* Si autem grex unus est, quomodo potest gregi annumerari qui in numero gregis non est? Aut pastor haberi quomodo potest qui (manente vero pastore, et in Ecclesia Dei ordinatione succidanea præsidente) nemini succedens, et a seipso incipiens, alienus sit et profanus, Dominicæ pacis ac Divinæ unitatis inimicus; non habitans in domo Dei, *i. e.* in Ecclesia Dei, in qua non nisi concordes et unanimes habitant? Ep. 69, p. 181, 182.

[2] Ὁ ἰκδικητὴς οὐν τοῦ ἐυαγγιλίου οὐκ ἠπίστατο ἵνα Ἐπίσκοπον δεῖ εἶναι ἐν καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. Euseb. H. E. Lib. 6, cap. 35.

[3] Nos Cornelium Episcopum sanctissimæ Catholicæ Ecclesiæ electum a Deo Omnipotente et Christo Domino nostro scimus. Nos errorem nos-

Indeed, two Bishops at once, of one church or city, were then thought as great an absurdity as two fathers of one child, or two husbands of one wife, or two heads of one body, or whatever else you can call monstrous in either nature or morality.

2. There was no canonical vacancy, no place for a new Bishop, but where the one Bishop, whose the chair had been, was dead, or had ceded, or was canonically deposed by the rest of the members of the Episcopal College. Vacancy by death hath no difficulties. I don't remember to have observed any instances of cession in St Cyprian's time; (though there were some before, and many after); unless it was in the case of Basilides, who, after he had forfeited his title to that sacred dignity by being guilty of the dreadful crimes of idolatry and blasphemy, is said to have laid it down, and to have confessed, that he should be favourably dealt by, if thereafter he should be admitted to the communion of *laicks*.[1] We have instances of a deposition in the same Basilides and Martialis,[2] in Marcianus,[3] Privatus Lambesitanus,[4] Evaristus,[5] Fortunatianus,[6] and perhaps some more. However, these three, I say, were the only causes in which there could be a lawful vacancy.

3. When a See was thus canonically vacant, it was filled after this manner: The Bishops of the province in which the vacancy was, met, choosed and ordained one in the presence of the people whom he was to govern. This, St Cyprian, with other thirty-six Bishops, tells us, was of Divine institution, and apostolical observation; and that it was the common form, not only in Africa, but almost in every province all the world over.[7] I know it is contro-

trum confitemur; nos imposturam passi sumus; circumventi sumus perfidia et loquacitate captiosa. Nec enim ignoramus unum Deum esse; unum Christum esse Dominum, quem confessi sumus; unum Spiritum Sanctum; unum Episcopum in Catholica Ecclesia esse debere. Ep. 49, p. 93.

[1] Ep. 67. [2] Ibid. [3] Ep. 68. [4] Ep. 36. [5] Ep. 50 and 52. [6] Ep. 65.

[7] Propter quod diligenter de traditione Divina et Apostolica observatione servandum est et tenendum, quod apud nos quoque et fere per provincias universas tenetur, ut ad ordinationes rite celebrandas, ad eam plebem, cui præpositus ordinatur, Episcopi ejusdem provinciæ proximi

verted whether a Bishop, in those times, was chosen by the people, or only in the presence of the people? But my present purpose doth not engage me in that controversie.

4. But election was not enough: Though the person elected was already a presbyter, and in priestly order, yet when he was to be promoted to a Bishoprick, he was to receive a new imposition of hands, a new ordination. His former orders were not sufficient for that supreme office. Thus, *e. g.* St Cyprian was first a Presbyter, and then ordained Bishop of Carthage, if we may believe his Deacon Pontius, Eusebius, and St Jerome.[1] Thus our Holy Martyr tells us, that Cornelius had made his advances gradually, through all the inferior stations, and so, no doubt, had been a Presbyter before he was a Bishop.[2] And yet we find, when he was promoted to the See of Rome, he was ordained by sixteen Bishops.[3] Thus we find also, in the promotion of Sabinus to the Bishoprick from which Basilides had fallen, that he was ordained by the imposition of the hands of the Bishops who were then present at his election.[4] Thus Fortunatus, Ahimnius, Optatus, Privatianus, Donatulus, and Felix, six Bishops, ordained a Bishop at Capsis.[5] Thus Heraclas was first a Presbyter under Demetrius in the Church of Alexandria, and then succeeded to him in the Episcopal chair.[6] Dionysius was first a Presbyter under

quique conveniant, et Episcopus deligatur, plebe præsente, &c.—Ep. 67, p. 172. Præter illud quod in hac eadem Epistola, De Sabino, legere est, hujus ritus, tanquam jam tum triti, in successore, Narcisso Hierosolymitani, substituendo, exemplum luculentum habes apud Euseb. l. 6, c. 9.—[This case was peculiar, not coming under either of the three cases mentioned above. Narcissus privately withdrew into a desert, and his friends remained ignorant of the place of his retreat. The See was filled up, and, after some years, when several prelates had successively held it, Narcissus returned, "*tanquam ex mortuis*," and the brethren all entreated him to reassume the reins of government. He did so, but the weight of years so oppressed him, that it was necessary to appoint a coadjutor, who should share with the aged prelate the arduous duties of the Episcopate. Alexander was the person selected, who mentions in a letter to the authorities that his colleague had passed by his 116th year.—E.]

[1] Pontius in vita Cypr. p. 2, 3. Euseb. Chron. Hieron. Catal.

[2] Per omnia ecclesiastica officia promotus —— ad Sacerdotii sublime fastigium cunctis gradibus ascendit. Ep. 55, p. 103.

[3] Ep. 55, p. 112. [4] Ep. 67, p. 172. [5] Ep. 56, p. 115.

[6] Euseb. H. E. lib. 6, c. 20.

Heraclas, and then succeeded to him.[1] And Maximus, who had been a Presbyter under him, succeeded to Dionysius.[2] And before all these, some seventy years before St Cyprian's time, Irenæus was first a Presbyter under Photinus, and afterwards his successor in the Bishoprick of Lyons.[3] Nor is it to be doubted that each of these was raised to the Episcopal dignity by a new ordination. The first of the Canons, commonly called Apostolical, which requires that a Bishop be ordained by two or three Bishops, was, doubtless, all along observed.[4] Nay, this new necessity of a new ordination for raising one to the Episcopal power, was so notorious and received then, that the Schismaticks themselves believed it indispensible. And therefore Novatianus, though formerly a Presbyter, (as Cornelius tells expressly in that so often cited Epistle to Fabius,) when he rivalled it with Cornelius for the chair of Rome, that he might have the shew, at least, of a canonical ordination, he got three simple inconsiderate Bishops to come to the city, upon pretence of consulting with other Bishops about settling the commotions of the Church; and having them once in his clutches, he shut them up under lock and key, till they were put in a scandalous disorder, and then forced them to give him the Episcopal mission, by an imaginary and vain imposition of hands, as Cornelius words it.[5] Thus also, when Fortunatus, one of the five Presbyters who joined with the schismatical Felicissimus against St Cyprian, turned bold to set up as an anti-bishop at Carthage, he was ordained by five false Bishops.[6] And now, Sir, by this account, I think we have our author's definition of a Bishop, in St Cyprian's time, fairly routed a second time. For,

How could the maxim of but one Bishop, at once, in a Church hold, if that Bishop was nothing but a single presbyter? The Church of Rome was but one Church, so was the Church of Carthage; and yet in each of these Churches there were many single presbyters. Again,

[1] Ibid. c. 28. [2] Lib. 7, c. 10. [3] Euseb. H. E. l. 5, c. 4, 6.

[4] Ἐπισκοπος χειροτονεισθω ὑπο Ἐπισκοπων δυο ἢ τριῶν. Canon. Apost. 1.

[5] Μετὰ βίας ἀνάγκασεν ἰδιωτικὴ τινι καί ματαίᾳ χειροτιθεσία ἐπισκοπὴν αυτῷ δοῦναι. Euseb. lib. 6, cap. 35.

[6] Ep. 59, p. 133.

If a Bishop, in St Cyprian's time, was no more than a single presbyter, in the presbyterian sense, what needed so much work about him? Why, *e. g.* convene all the presbyters of a province, such as Africa or Numidia was, for the election and ordination of a single presbyter in Carthage, where there were presbyters more than enough to have performed all the business? What needed the Church of Rome to make such work about supplying such a vacancy as was there, before Cornelius was promoted? Why a convention of sixteen neighbouring Bishops to give him holy orders? Might not the forty-six who lived in Rome have served the turn? Might not these forty-six, I say, have filled Fabianus his room, with far greater ease and expedition? If they made such work, and had such difficulties, (as we find they had about a Bishop,) in settling one single brother presbyter, when, according to our author's principles, they had the full power of doing it, what had become of them, if thirty, nay twenty, nay ten of the forty-six, had all died in one year? sure they had never got so many vacancies filled. And then,

Were not Cornelius and Novatianus presbyters of Rome, before the former was the true, and the latter the false Bishop of that city? If so, what need of a new election and a new ordination for making the presbyters of a Church, of which they were presbyters already? Had it not been pretty pleasant in such a grave, serious, persecuted state of the Church, to have seen two eminent men, already *presbyters* of Rome, making so much work about being made *presbyters* of Rome? And all the clergy and christians of Rome, nay sooner or later, of all the christians in the world, engaged in the quarrel? what had this been other than the very mystery of ridiculousness? But this is not all.

The premises will as little allow him to have been a Presbyterian Moderator; for to what purpose so much ado about the establishment of a mere Moderator of a Presbytery? Why so much stress laid upon only one Moderator in a city? Why no canonical vacancy of his moderatorial chair, unless in the case of death, cession, or forfeiture? Sure, if they had then understood all the exigencies and analogies of parity, they would not have been so much in

love with a constant Moderator; no, they would have judged him highly inconvenient, and by all means to be shunned; if he had been imposed on the meeting, it had been an encroachment on their intrinsic power; and so, absolutely unlawful, and Prelacy; and though chosen by themselves, fatal, as having a violent tendency to lordly Prelacy; and therefore they could never have yielded to have one with a good conscience.[1]

Again, how often did the Presbytery of Rome meet in the interval between Fabianus his death, and Cornelius his promotion? How many excellent Epistles did they write to the neighbouring Bishops and Churches, and these, about the most weighty and important matters during that vacancy? They wrote that which is the eighth in number, amongst St Cyprian's Epistles to the Carthaginian Clergy, and, at the same time, one to St Cyprian, then in his retirement, which is lost. They wrote that notable epistle, which is the thirtieth in number, in which they not only mention other of their epistles which they had wrote to St Cyprian, and which are not now extant, but also epistles, one or more, which they had sent to Sicily. They wrote also that considerable epistle, which is number the thirty-sixth. It is not to be doubted that they wrote many more. How many meetings and consultations had they, during these sixteen months, about the affairs of the Church, and particularly the case of the Lapsi, which was then so much agitated? Is it probable that they wanted a Moderator? a mouth of their meeting? one to keep order in the manner and managing of the affairs were brought before them all that time, and in all those meetings? How could they, without one, handle matters with order and decency? And what was there to hinder them from having one, if they had a mind for him! Might they not have chosen one as safely as they met? Might they not have chosen one at every meeting, according to the principles of parity. Further:

What need of so much parade about the election of a Moderator of a presbytery, as was then about the election of a Bishop? Why the people chose him according to the

[1] *Vide* True Representation of Presbyterian Government, Prop. 15.

principles of those who think that St Cyprian was for popular elections? What was the people's interest? How was it their concern, who was Moderator of the presbytery? What was his influence, *de jure*, at least in the government of the Church, more than the influence of any other member of the presbytery? Nay, is it not confessed, that as Moderator, he was no Church Governor at all? That he had no jurisdiction over his brethren? That his power was only ordinative, not decisive? To be the mouth of the meeting, not to be their will, or commanding faculty? To keep order in the manner and managing of what came before them, not to determine what was debated amongst them? Why, then, were the people so much concerned about him? What benefits or what harm could redound to them by one being Moderator of the presbytery, whatever he was? Besides, as I have shewed before, as Moderator of the presbytery, he had relation only to the presbytery; at least, he had none directly, immediately and formally to the people. What pretence, then, could the people have to interest themselves in his election, nay, (say as I am apt to think it ought to be said), I am sure the contrary cannot be made appear from St Cyprian), that he was not chosen by the people, but only in their presence; and the same argument will take place, as is obvious to anybody. Farther yet.

What need of convocating so many from the neighbourhood for managing the election of a Moderator, *e. g.* for the presbytery of Rome? If a Bishop in St Cyprian's time was nothing but a presbyterian Moderator, then the Bishops convocated for managing the election of a Moderator were Moderators too; and so, by consequence, sixteen Moderators of other presbyteries met at Rome to constitute a Moderator for the Roman presbytery. And might not the presbytery of Rome have chosen their own Moderator without the trouble or the inspection of so many Moderators of other presbyteries? Once more.

What necessity, nay, what congruity, of a new imposition of hands, of a new ordination, a new mission for constituting one a Moderator of a presbytery? And this, too, to be performed by none but Moderators of other presbyteries?

Thus, *e. g.* it behoved six Moderators to meet at Capsis, to ordain a Moderator for the Presbytery of Capsis; and sixteen at Rome, to ordain a Moderator for the Presbytery of Rome; and after he was ordained, it behoved Novatianus to be at so much pains to get together three Moderators, to ordain himself an Anti-Moderator. Who can think on these things without smiling? But perhaps you may think I have insisted on this argument more than enough; and therefore I shall leave it, and proceed to other considerations. To go on, then.

A Bishop in St Cyprian's time, thus elected, ordained, and possessed of his chair, did bear a double relation; one to the particular church over which he was set, and another to the Church Catholic, an integrant part whereof the particular church was of which he was Bishop. The consideration of each of these reasons will furnish us with fresh arguments against our author's hypothesis. I shall begin with the relation he bore to his own particular church. And,

First, The first thing I observe about him in that regard shall be, that he was the principle of unity to her. Whosoever adhered to him, and lived in his communion, was in the church a catholic christian. Whosoever separated from him was out of the church, and a schismatick. He was the head of all the christians living within his district; and they were one body, one society, one church, by depending upon him, by being subject to him, by keeping to his communion. He was the sun, and they were the beams; he was the root, and they were the branches; he was the fountain, and they were the streams; as St Cyprian explains the matter.[1] This is a point of great consequence, especially considering that it is the foundation of the apologist's argument, our author's answer to which I am examining; and therefore, give me leave to handle it somewhat fully. And I proceed by these steps.

1. There was nothing St Cyprian and the Catholick Bishops, his cotemporaries, valued more, reckoned of higher importance, or laid greater stress upon, than the unity of the Church; and there was no sin they represented as more heinous, or more criminal, than the sin of schism.

[1] Unit. Eccl. p. 108. [Ben. Ed. p. 195.—E.]

In their reckoning, unity was the great badge of christianity; God heard the prayers that were put up in unity,[1] but not those that were performed in schism. Christian peace, brotherly concord, and the unity of people in the true faith and worship of God, was accounted of greater value by them than all other imaginable sacrifices.[2] Nothing afforded greater pleasure to the angels in heaven, than harmony amongst christians on earth.[3] It were easie to collect a thousand such testimonies concerning the excellency of unity. But as for schism and schismaticks, how may it make men's hearts to tremble, when they hear what hard names, and what horrid notions, these primitive worthies gave them, and had of them? Schism, to them, was the devil's device for subverting the faith, corrupting the truth, and cutting unity.[4] Christ instituted the Church, and the devil heresie,[5] or schism; for both then went commonly under one name. Schism was reckoned a greater crime than idolatry itself; and St Cyprian proves it by several arguments.[6] Firmilian affirms it also.[7] So doth Dionysius of Alexandria, in his notable epistle to Novatus. He tells him, he ought to have suffered the greatest miseries rather than divide the Church of God; that martyrdom, for the preservation of unity, was as glorious as martyrdom for not sacrificing to idols; nay, more, because who suffers rather than he will sacrifice, suffers only for saving his own soul; but he that suffers for unity, suffers for the whole Church.[8] Schismaticks had not the spirit;[9] were forsaken of the Spirit;[10] held not the faith;[11] had neither Father, Son, nor Holy Ghost.[12] They were renegadoes,[13] apostates,[14]

[1] Unit. Eccl. p. 112.
[2] Sacrificium Deo majus est pax nostra, et fraterna concordia, et de unitate Patris et Spiritus Sancti plebs adunata. Cyp. de Orat. Dom. p. 149.
[3] Firmil. Ep. inter Cyprianicas 75, p. 217.
[4] Cyp. Un. Eccl. p. 105.
[5] Conc. Carth. Suff. 69.
[6] Un. Eccl. p. 117.
[7] Firmil. Ep. inter Cyprian. 75, p. 227.
[8] Euseb. H. E. l. 6, c. 37, Ed. Col. Allob.
[9] Cyp. Ep. 69, p. 185.
[10] Ibid. Ep. 59, p. 138.
[11] Un. Eccl. p. 108, 109.
[12] Conc. Carth. Suff. 10.
[13] Cyp. Ep. 51, p. 95.
[14] Ep. 55, p. 103.

malignants,[1] paricides,[2] antichrists,[3] false Christs,[4] Christ's enemies,[5] blasphemers,[6] the devil's priests,[7] retainers to Corah,[8] retainers to Judas,[9] villainous and perfidious,[10] aliens, profane, enemies,[11] were without hope,[12] had no right to the promises,[13] could not be saved,[14] were infidels, worse than heathens,[15] self-condemned,[16] were no more Christians than the devil,[17] could not belong to Christ,[18] could not go to heaven,[19] the hottest part of hell their portion,[20] their society, the synagogue of Satan,[21] their conventicles, dens of thieves,[22] they were destroyers of souls,[23] their preaching was poisonous,[24] their baptism pestiferous,[25] and profane,[26] their sacrifices abominable,[27] they could not be martyrs,[28] their company was to be avoided,[29] whoso befriended them were persecutors of the truth,[30] were betrayers of Christ's spouse to adulterers,[31] were betrayers of unity,[32] were involved in the same guilt with them.[33] In short, schismaticks,

[1] Ep. 55, p. 105.

[2] Ep. 57, p. 117.—[Contra Ecclesiam parricidalia quotidie arma suscipiunt.—E.] [3] Conc. Carth. Suff. 1, 11, 64, 87. Ep. 69, p. 180.

[4] Conc. Carth. Suff. 5. [5] Ib. Suff. 7 and 21. [6] Suff. 1, 31.

[7] Suff. 1. [8] Un. Eccl. p. 116.

[9] Cyp. de Orat. Dom. p. 150.—[Imitator Judæ.—E.]

[10] Un Eccl. p. 116. [11] Ibid. p. 109. [12] Cyp. Ep. 69, p. 182.

[13] Un. Eccl. p. 109.—[A promissis Ecclesia separatur.—E.]

[14] Cyp. Ep. 4, p. 9. [15] Conc. Carth. Suff. 1.

[16] Suff. 37. [17] Ep. 59, p. 140.

[18] Un. Eccl. p. 114.—[Sic se Christianum esse profitetur quomodo et Christum diabolus sæpe mentitur, ipso Domino præmonente et dicente; "*Multi* venient in nomine meo dicentes. Ego sum Christus et multos fallent." Sicut ille Christus non est, quamvis fallat in nomine, ita nec Christianus videri potest, qui non permanet in evangelii ejus et fidei veritate. Ed. Bened. p. 199.]

[19] Un. Eccl. p. 114.—Con. Carth. Suff. 24. Ep. 55. p. 112. [20] Ibid.

[21] Ep. 69, p. 182.—[The words in the text are rather freely translated, although they do not express more than the meaning of the original—"Perditionem sibi maximam de indignatione Dei acquirant, qui schisma faciunt, et relicto Episcopo, alium sibi foris pseudo Episcopum constituunt.—E.]

[22] Con. Carth. Suff. 60. [23] Ep. 73, p. 207. [24] Ep. 72, p. 197.

[25] Un. Eccl. p. 111. Con. Carth. Suff. 29, Ep. 43, p. 83.

[26] Un. Eccl. p. 112. [27] Ep. 69, p. 180. Un. Eccl. p. 113.

[28] P. 113, 114, 117, in Ep. passim.

[29] Un. Eccl. p. 115. Ep. 59, p. 140.

[30] Con. Carth. Suff. 38. [31] Ibid. Suff. 49, 58, 61.

[32] Ep. 73, p. 203. [33] Ep. 69, p. 184.

by being such, were, *ipso facto*, persecutors of the church,[1] enemies of mercy,[2] infatuated salt,[3] and cursed of God.[4]

Such, I say, were the notions the Holy Fathers, in those early times of the Church, had of schismaticks, and such were the names they gave them. And certainly whoso seriously considers how much schism is condemned in Holy Writ; what an enemy it is to the peace, the power, and the propagation of Christianity; and how much it stands in opposition to the holy, humble, peaceable, patient, meek, and charitable spirit of the Gospel: whoso considers that our blessed Saviour's great errand into the world was to unite all his disciples here into one body and one communion, that they might eternally be blessed in the full enjoyment of one communion with the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in heaven hereafter: whoso, I say, considers these things, cannot but confess that schism and schismaticks deserve all these hard names, and answer all these terrible notions. Now,

2. That, for the preservation of unity, and the preventing of schism, in every particular Church, all were bound, by the principles of St Cyprian's age, to live in the Bishop's communion; and to own and look upon him as the principle of unity to that Church, of which he was head and ruler, might be made appear from a vast train of testimonies. But I shall content myself with a few. Thus, for example, when some of the lapsed presumed to write to St Cyprian, and design themselves without a Bishop, by the name of a Church, how did the holy man resent it? Consider how he begins his answer to them. "Our Lord," says he, "whose precepts we ought to honour and obey, instituting the honour of a Bishop, and the contexture of a Church, saith thus to Peter in the Gospel; 'I say unto thee thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' &c. From thence by the vicissitudes of times and successions, the ordination of Bishops, and the frame of the Church, are transmitted

[1] Ep. 43, p. 82, 85.
[2] Ep. 60, p. 142.
[3] Con. Carth. Suff. 7.
[4] Ibid. Suff. 1.

so as that the Church is built upon the Bishops, and all her affairs are ordered by them as the Chief Rulers; and therefore, seeing this is God's appointment, I cannot but admire the bold temerity of some, who writing to me, call themselves a Church, when a Church is only to be found in the Bishop, the Clergy, and the faithful Christians. God forbid that a number of lapsed should be called a Church," &c. Consider how he reasons. By Divine Institution there cannot be a Church without a Bishop: The Church is founded on the Bishop: The Bishop, as Chief Ruler, orders all the affairs of the Church: Therefore, those lapsed ought not to have called themselves a Church, seeing they had no Bishop, no principle of unity.[1] We have another notable reasoning, as well as testimony of his, in his 43d Epistle written to his people of Carthage, upon the breaking out of Felicissimus, his schism. "God is One," says he, "and Christ is One, and the Church is One, and the Chair is One, by our Lord's own voice, founded on St Peter. Another altar cannot be reared, another priesthood cannot be erected, besides the one altar, and the one priesthood. Whoso gathereth elsewhere, scattereth. Whatever human fury institutes against God's appointment, is adulterous, is impious, is sacrilegious." And a little after—"O Brethren? Let no man make you wander from the ways of the Lord: O Christians! Let no man rend you from the Gospel of Christ: Let no man tear the sons of the Church from the Church: Let them perish alone, who will needs perish: Let them abide alone out of the Church, who have departed from the Church: Let them, alone, not be with the Bishops, who have rebelled against

[1] Dominus noster, cujus præcepta metuere et observare debemus, Episcopi honorem, et Ecclesiæ suæ rationem disponens in Evangelio loquitur et dicit Petro; "*Ego tibi dico, quia tu es Petrus, et super istam Petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam, et portæ inferorum non vincent eam; et tibi dabo claves regni cœlorum,*" &c.—Inde per temporum et successionum vices, Episcoporum ordinatio, et ecclesiæ ratio decurrit, ut ecclesia super Episcopos constituatur. Et omnes actus ecclesiæ per eosdem præpositos gubernetur. Cum hoc itaque Divina lege fundatum sit, miror quosdam audaci temeritate sic mihi scribere voluisse ut Ecclesiæ nomine literas facerent; quando ecclesia in Episcopo et clero, et in omnibus stantibus sit constituta: Absit enim, ne Domini misericordia et potestas ejus invidiam patiatur, ut Ecclesia esse dicatur lapsorum numerus. Ep. 33, p. 66.

the Bishops," &c.[1] And as I observed before, in his Epistle to Florentinus Pupianus, he defines a Church to be "a people united to their priest, and a flock adhering to their pastor," &c., and from thence tells Pupianus, that he ought to consider that the Bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the Bishop: So that if any are not with the Bishop, they are not in the Church.[2] And how concernedly doth he reason the case in his book of the "Unity of the Church?" "Can he seem to himself," says he, "to be with Christ, who is against Christ's priests?—Who separates himself from the society of Christ's clergy and people? That man bears arms against the Church: He fights against God's ordinance: He is an enemy of the altar: a rebel against Christ's sacrifice. He is perfidious and not faithful, sacrilegious and not religious. He is an undutiful servant, an impious son, an hostile brother, who can contemn God's bishops, and forsake his priests, and dares to set up another altar, and offer up unlawful prayers,"[3] &c. Indeed, in that same book he calls the Bishop, "The glue that cements Christians into the solid unity of the Church."[4] And hence it is,

3. That St Cyprian everywhere makes the contempt of

[1] Deus unus est, et Christus unus, et una Ecclesia, et cathedra una super Petrum—[Petram. Ed. Bened.—E.]—Domini voce fundata. Aliud altare constitui, aut sacerdotium novum fieri, præter unum altare, et unum sacerdotium, non potest. Quisquis alibi collegerit, spargit. Adulterum est, impium est, sacrilegium est, quodcunque humano furore instituitur, ut dispositio Divina violetur —— Nemo vos, fratres, errare a Domini viis faciat. Nemo vos Christianos ab Evangelio Christi rapiat. Nemo filios Ecclesiæ de Ecclesia tollat. Pereant sibi soli, qui perire voluerunt. Extra Ecclesiam soli remaneant, qui de Ecclesia recesserunt. Soli cum Episcopis non sint, qui contra Episcopos rebellarunt. Ep. 43, p. 83, 84.

[2] Vide *supra*, page 13.

[3] An esse sibi cum Christo videtur, qui adversus sacerdotes Christi facit? Qui se a cleri ejus et plebis societate secernit? Arma ille contra Ecclesiam portat. Contra Dei dispositionem pugnat. Hostis altaris; adversus sacrificium Christi rebellis; pro fide, perfidus; pro religione, sacrilegus; inobsequens servus; filius impius; frater inimicus; contemptis Episcopis et Dei sacerdotibus derelictis. Constituere audet aliud altare, precem alteram, illicitis vocibus facere, &c. De Unit. Eccl. p. 116.

[4] Deus unus est, et Christus unus, et una Ecclesia ejus, et fides una et plebs in solidam corporis unitatem, concordiæ glutino copulata. Ibid. p. 119.

the one Bishop, or undutifulness to him, the origin of schisms and heresies. Thus Epistle 3, he makes this observation upon the undutifulness of a certain deacon to Rogatianus, his Bishop: That "such are the first efforts of hereticks, and the outbreaking and presumptions of ill-advised schismaticks; they follow their own fancies, and, in the pride of their hearts, contemn their superiours. So men separate from the Church: so they erect profane altars without the Church: so they rebel against christian peace, and Divine order and unity."[1] And Epistle 59, he tells Cornelius that "heresies and schisms spring from this only fountain, that God's Priest (the Bishop) is not obeyed; and men don't consider that, at the same time, there ought to be only one Bishop, only one judge, as Christ's vicar, in a Church."[2] And Epistle 66 to Florentius Pupianus, that "from hence heresies and schisms have hitherto sprung, and do daily spring; that the Bishop, who is one, and is set over the Church, is contemned by the proud presumption of some; and he that is honoured of God, is dishonoured by men."[3] And a little after he tells him, alluding clearly to the monarchical power of Bishops, that "bees have a king, and beasts have a captain, and robbers, with all humility, obey their commander;" and from thence he concludes, "how unreasonable it must be for Christians not to pay suitable regards to their Bishops."[4] And in another place, "then

[1] Hæc sunt enim initia hæreticorum, et ortus atque ornatus schismaticorum male cogitantium, ut sibi placeant, et præpositum superbo tumore contemnant. Sic de Ecclesia receditur; sic altare profanum foris collocatur; sic contra pacem Christi, et ordinationem atque unitatem Dei rebellatur. Ep. 3, p. 6.

[2] Neque enim aliunde hæreses obortæ sunt, aut nata sunt schismata quam inde, quod sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur: Nec unus in Ecclesia, ad tempus sacerdos, et ad tempus judex, vice Christi cogitatur. Ep. 59, p. 129.

[3] Inde enim schismata et hæreses obortæ sunt et oriuntur, dum Episcopus qui unus est, et Ecclesiæ præest, superba quorundam presumptione contemnitur; et homo dignatione Dei honoratus indignus ab hominibus judicatur. Ep. 66, p. 167.

[4] Apes habent regem, et ducem pecudes, et fidem servant latrones, mancipi obsequio pleno humilitatis obtemperant. Quanto simpliciores et meliores vobis sunt brutæ pecudes, et muta animalia, et cruenti licet ac furentes inter gladios, atque inter arma prædones? Præpositus illic agnoscitur et

is the bond of our Lord's peace broken, then is brotherly charity violated, then is the truth adulterated, and unity divided, then men leap out into heresies and schisms :" When? "When the Priests are controlled, when the Bishops are envied, when one grudges that himself was not rather preferred, or disdains to bear with a superior."[1] Indeed,

4. By the principles of those times, the Bishop was so much the principle of unity to the Church which he governed, the whole society had such a dependance on him, was so virtually in him, and represented by him—that what he did, as Bishop, was reputed the deed of the whole Church which he ruled. If he was orthodox and catholick, so was the body united to him reckoned to be. If heretical or schismatical, it went under the same denomination. If he denied the faith, whoso adhered to him, after that, were reputed to have denied it. If he confessed the faith, the whole Church was reckoned to have confessed it in him.

Thus we find, when Martialis and Basilides, two Spanish Bishops, committed idolatry, and so forfeited their Bishopricks, and yet some of their people inclined to continue in their communion—St Cyprian, with other thirty-six Bishops, tells those people—That it behoved them not to flatter themselves, by thinking, that they could "continue to communicate with polluted Bishops, and withal, themselves continue pure and unpolluted: For all that communicated with them would be partakers of their guilt: And therefore," as they go on, "a people, obeying and fearing God, ought to separate from criminal Bishops, and be careful not to mix with them in their sacrilegious sacrifices."[2] And

timetur, quem non sententia Divina constituit, sed in quem factio perdita et nocens caterva consensit. Ibid.

[1] Hinc dominicæ pacis vinculum rumpitur, hinc charitatis fraterna violatur, hinc adulteratur veritas, unitas scinditur, ad hæreses atque ad schismata prosilitur, dum obtrectatur sacerdotibus, dum Episcopis invidetur; cum quis aut quæritur non se potius ordinatum, aut dedignatur alterum ferre præpositum. De Zelo et Livore, p. 223.

[2] Nec sibi plebs blandiatur, quasi immunis esse a contagio delicti possit, cum sacerdote peccatore communicans, et ad injustum et illicitum præpositi sui Episcopatum, consensum suum commodans; quando per Osee Prophetam (Hos. 9, 4), comminetur et dicat censura Divina—docens scilicet

again, in that same Synodical Epistle, they say—That "it was a neglecting of Divine discipline, and an unaccountable rashness to communicate with Martialis and Basilides: For whosoever joyned with them in their unlawful communions, were polluted by the contagion of their guilt: And whosoever were partakers with them in the crime, would not be separated from them in the punishment."[1] Indeed, this is the great purpose of that 67th Epistle, and also of the 68th, concerning Marcianus, who, by communicating with Novatianus, had rendered his own communion infectious and abominable.[2]

On the other hand, when Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, confessed the faith before the heathen persecutors, St Cyprian says, "The whole Roman church confessed."[3] And when Cyprian himself, having confessed, received the sentence of death, being then at Utica, he wrote to his presbyters, deacons, and people at Carthage, telling them how earnest he was to suffer at Carthage; "because," as he reasons, "it was most congruous and becoming that a Bishop should confess Christ in that city in which he ruled Christ's church, that, by confessing in their presence, they might be all ennobled; for whatever," says he, "in the moment of confession, the confessing Bishop speaks, *God* assisting him, he speaks with the *mouth of all.*" And he goes on, telling them "how the honour of their glorious church of Carthage should be mutilated (as he words it), if he should suffer at Utica, especially, considering how earnest and frequent he had been in his prayers and wishes that he might, both for

et ostendens, omnes omnino ad peccatum constringi, qui fuerint profani et injusti sacerdotis sacrificio contaminati —— Propter quod plebs obsequens præceptis Dominicis, et Deum metuens a peccatore præposito separare se debet, nec se ad sacrilegi sacerdotis sacrificia miscere. Ep. 67, p. 171.

[1] Quare etsi aliqui de Collegis nostris —— Deificam disciplinam negligendam putant, et cum Basilide et Martiale temere communicant —— qui malis et peccatoribus —— illicita communione miscentur, nocentium contactibus polluuntur; et dum junguntur in culpa, sic nec in pœna separantur. Ibid. p. 175.

[2] Ep. 68.

[3] Virtus illic Episcopi præcedentis publice comprobata est; adunatio sequentis fraternitatis ostensa est. Dum apud vos, unus animus et una vox est, Ecclesia omnis Romana confessa est. Ep. 60, p. 141.

himself and *them*, confess in their presence at Carthage."[1] And upon the same principle it was, that he so frequently called his people "his bowels, his body, the members of his body;" and that he affirmed, that "their griefs were his griefs, their wounds his wounds, their distresses his distresses,"[2] &c. Upon the same principle it was also, that Pontius his deacon, having accounted how our holy martyr was executed in presence of the people, falls out into this rapture—"O blessed people of the Church of Carthage, that suffered together with such a Bishop, with their eyes and senses, and which is more, with open voice, and was crowned with him! For though all could not suffer in real effect, according to their common wishes, nor really be partakers of that glory; yet whosoever were sincerely willing to suffer in the sight of Christ, who was looking on, and in the hearing of their Bishop, did, in a manner, send an embassy to Heaven, by One who was a competent witness of their wishes."[3]

5. Neither was this of the Bishop's being the principle of unity to the Church, which he governed, a novel notion, newly minted in the Cyprianic age: For, besides that Episcopacy was generally believed, then, to be of Divine institution; besides, that St Cyprian still argues upon the supposition of a Divine institution as particularly, in the same very case of the Bishop's being the principle of unity, as may be

[1] Eo quod congruat Episcopum in ea civitate in qua Ecclesiæ Dominicæ præest, illic Dominum confiteri, et plebem universam præpositi præsentis confessione clarificari. Quodcunque enim sub illo confessionis momento Confessor Episcopus loquitur, aspirante Deo, *ore omnium* loquitur. Cæterum mutilabitur honor Ecclesiæ nostræ tam gloriosæ, si ego Episcopus alterius Ecclesiæ præpositus, accepta apud Uticam super confessione sententia, exinde martyr ad Dominum proficiscar; quandoquidem ego et pro *Me* et pro *Vobis* apud *Vos* confiteri, et ibi pati, et exinde ad Dominum proficisci, orationibus continuis deprecer, &c. Ep. 81, p. 238, 239.

[2] *Vide* Ep. 17, p. 39, et De Lapis, p. 122, 123, fuse.

[3] O beatum Ecclesiæ populum, qui Episcopo suo tali, et oculis pariter et sensibus, et quod amplius est, publicata voce compassus est, et sicut ipso tractante semper audierat, Deo judice coronatus est. Quamvis enim non potuerit evenire, quod optabant vota communia, ut consortio pacis gloriæ simul plebs tota pateretur; quicunque sub Christi spectantis oculis, et sub auribus sacerdotis ex animo pati voluit, per idoneum voti sui testem, legationis quodam modo literas ad Deum misit. Pontius in vita Cyp. p. 10.

seen in his "Reasoning against the Lapsed," which I have already cited from Epistle 33, and might be more fully made appear if it were needful. Besides these things, I say, we have the same thing frequently insisted on by the holy Ignatius, who was contemporary with the Apostles, in his *genuine* Epistles.[1] Thus, for instance, in his Epistle to the Church

[1] There are fifteen epistles which bear the name of Ignatius, and out of these it is admitted by our greatest and most judicious scholars, that eight are of doubtful authority, inasmuch as they contain many things liable to grave suspicion, and some which are at variance with the character of the Antiochian Martyr, and the Apostolic Age. But the *remaining seven* letters of this Venerable Father, who drew the waters of eternal life from the stream nearest to their source, after having undergone the ordeal of the closest criticism, have long been considered as objects of the deepest interest, on account of the distinct and emphatic terms in which they speak concerning certain vital matters relating to the doctrine and discipline of the Christian Church. The history of these *seven* epistles is of course familiar to many, but still it may be profitable to recount it here, because it is extremely desirable that all should be acquainted with the means which have been used for vindicating the authenticity of these precious relics of antiquity, which are so important in deciding the question at issue between Episcopalians and those who have adopted the modern and Calvinistic system of Ecclesiastical Government. On this point I subjoin the lucid and learned remarks of the Right Reverend Dr Russell, who thoroughly investigates the history of the Seven Epistles, from which the extracts in this treatise are taken, and which were quoted in days of old by the eminent ecclesiastical controversialists and historians, Athanasius, Eusebius, Jerome, and Theodoret—"Archbishop Usher was the first who, in days which may be called our own, attempted to restore the works of Ignatius, and to separate the pure from the impure. In the middle of the seventeenth century there was no Greek copy of them on which any reliance could be placed. There were, however, two ancient Latin versions of the epistles in manuscript; and the Irish Primate undertook the difficult task of correcting the original by a reference to them, and of detecting, so far as might be accomplished by such means, the spurious editions. His work, printed at Oxford in 1644, bears the following title:—'Polycarpi et Ignatii Epistolæ; una cum veteri interpretatione Latina, ex trium manuscriptorum codicum collatione integritati suæ restituta: Accedit et Ignatiarum Epistolarum versio antiqua alia, in duobus manuscriptis in Anglia repertis nunc primum in lucem edita. Quibus prefixa est, non de Ignatii solum et Polycarpi scriptis, sed etiam de Apostolicis Constitutionibus Clementi Romano tributis, Jacobi Usserii Archiepiscopo Armachani Dissertatio.' There are subjoined the Primate's annotations to these epistles, and a comparison of the readings of the Greek copies with each other, and with the Latin versions.

"But still a correct copy of the original Greek was wanting; and this desideratum was soon supplied by the discovery of an ancient manuscript in the Medicean library at Florence, which was published at Amsterdam

of Smyrna, he tells them—That "that is only a firm and solid communion which is under the Bishop, or allowed by

in the year 1646 by the celebrated Isaac Vossius. From this manuscript he printed six of the Ignatian Epistles mentioned by Eusebius, in their ancient and pure Greek. The seventh was shortly afterwards published at Paris by M. Ruinert, from a Greek copy which he discovered in the work called the martyrdom of St Ignatius.

"As there is no doubt that this apostolic Father did write such Epistles as those are which have been providentially preserved, it only remains to be proved that the copies we possess agree with the copies which Eusebius and others had in their hands; and this point seems to be clearly established by the fact, that the quotations found in the works of the ecclesiastical historian just named, and of Athanasius, St Jerome, Theodoret, and Gelasius, correspond precisely with the text of our copies, and no stronger proof than this can be adduced of the authenticity of any ancient composition.

"Such evidence could not fail to produce its due effect on every candid mind. Daillé, for example, readily acknowledged that Eusebius was acquainted with those epistles, and held them to be the real letters of Ignatius; nay, he farther admits that the epistles concerning which Eusebius writes, seem to be the very epistles now in our hands, published by Usher and Vossius. 'Fatemur Eusebium illas Epistolas agnoscere, et pro veré Ignatianis habere: neque dissimulamus eas de quibus ille verba facit has ipsas fuisse videri quæ his hodie nominibus circumferuntur; quales eas Reverendissimus Usserius Latinè, eruditissimus Vossius Græcè, ex libris ille Anglicanis, hic Medicæis ediderunt.' To this passage, quoted by Pearson in his *Vind. Ignat.* the learned Prelate adds—'Cum tot omnium sæculorum testimonia adduxerimus, nihil ulterius, quod ad argumentum externum attinet, desiderari posse videatur."—Cap. ii.

Having narrated the history of these important documents, Dr Russell thus concludes—"I am not aware that so satisfactory an account could be given of the manuscripts of any classical author, as has now been presented relative to those of the three Christian Fathers. (He is speaking of Clement of Rome, and Polycarp, as well as Ignatius). These Apostolic men are quoted by writers who lived at no great distance from their time; and the passages thus cited agree precisely with the copies still in our hands." *Vide* Sermon preached at Stirling 7th March 1830, by the Right Rev. M. Russell, LL.D. 3d Ed. Appendix, p. 55-56. Since the Scottish Prelate delivered this opinion upon a question which was generally believed to have been for ever set at rest, circumstances have occurred which, though to my mind they do not alter the case, are, however, of sufficient importance to demand a notice here. During the last year, an entirely new recension of "the Seven Epistles" has been presented to the world, in a *Syriac* version. Its history is briefly as follows:—It seems that the trustees of the British Museum, aided by the liberality of the Government, dispatched the Rev. Henry Tattam, Arch-Deacon of Bedford, on a mission of search for ancient MSS. to the Monastery of Deipana, in the desert of Scete or Nitria, in Egypt;

him;" and, "That the multitude ought still to be with the Bishop."[1] Plainly importing this much at least, that there

which Monastery had previously been visited for the same purpose, with considerable success, by Lord Prudhoe; and the result of the Arch-Deacon's visit was, that he acquired about 250 vols. which were safely deposited, though in the utmost confusion, in the British Museum. Here it fell to the lot of the Rev. W. Cureton to arrange these valuable materials, who, as we learn from a cotemporary periodical, "appears to have discharged this duty with great zeal and assiduity."—English Review, No. 8, Dec. 1845, p. 310. To this gentleman the public are indebted for the literary curiosity already alluded to, which has been published under the following title—"An Ancient Syriac Version of the Epistles of St Ignatius to St Polycarp, the Ephesians and the Romans; together with Extracts from his Epistles, collected from the writings of Severus of Antioch, Timotheus of Alexandria, and others. Edited, with an English Translation and Notes." London: Rivingtons, &c. These epistles, *as far as they go*, correspond with those bearing the same titles in the received Greek text; but there is this striking discrepancy between the Syriac and Greek versions, that the former does not contain *half the quantity of matter which is found in the latter*. The question therefore comes to be—Is the Syriac a mutilated version—or is the Greek Ignatius an interpolation? Mr Cureton decides in favour of the Syriac, "as most nearly representing what St Ignatius himself wrote." But we are rather disposed to agree with the Reviewer in his opinion, "that it is a miserable Epitome made by an Eutychian heretic, and so far from invalidating the claim of the Greek text to be received as the genuine language of Ignatius, it does in fact greatly corroborate and confirm it." What appears to us irrefragably to establish this opinion, are the facts, that those very "Extracts" which Mr Cureton appends to his "Syriac Version," which are of equal date with the version itself, contain passages quoted from the epistles of Ignatius, which are not to be found in the "Syriac" version, but which *are* found in the authorized Greek text, and *correspond exactly* with it; and that many other passages quoted by ancient authors of the earliest date, as from the genuine epistles of Ignatius, which are found in the Greek version, are *wanting* in this recent discovery. Those who wish to investigate the matter more closely, will meet with a very clear analysis of the argument in the "English Review" of the above quoted date. But whatever conclusion the reader may arrive at concerning the relative merits of these several versions, it is satisfactory to know, that even the "*Syriac*" abounds with evidence in favour of the Episcopal constitution of the Christian Church, and the threefold orders of ministry, as may be seen from the following extract from the Epistle to St Polycarp. "If a man vaunt himself as wiser than his Bishop, he is corrupted: Give heed to the Bishops, that God may give heed to you. I give my life for those who submit to their Bishop, Priest, and Deacons, and may I have my portion with them in God."

[1] Ἐπείνη βεβαιὰ ἐυχαριστία ἡγείσθω, ἡ ὑπὸ τον Ἐπίσκοπον οὖσα, ἢ ᾧ ἂν ἀυτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ. Ὅπου ἂν φανῇ ὁ Ἐπίσκοπος ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔστω. Edit. Lond. 1680, p. 6.—Ed. Oxon. p. 4.—E.]

can be no true Christian communion, unless it be in the unity of the Church, and there can be no communion in the unity of the Church, in opposition to the Bishop. And in his Epistle to the Philadelphians—"These who belong to God and Jesus Christ are with the Bishops; and these are God's that they may live by Jesus Christ, who, forsaking their sins, come into the unity of the Church."[1] And again, in that same Epistle, "God doth not dwell where there is division and wrath; God only pardons those who, repenting, join in the unity of God, and in society with the Bishop;"[2] and he has also that very same notion of the Bishop's being so much the principle of unity, that, as it were, the whole Church is represented in him. Thus he tells the Ephesians, that "he received their whole body, in their Bishop Onesimus;"[3] and in his Epistle to Trallians, he tells them, that "in Polybius their Bishop, who came to him at Smyrna, he beheld their whole society."[4]

6. Indeed, this principle of the Bishop's being the centre of unity to his Church, was most reasonable and accountable in itself. Every particular Church is an organized political body, and there can be no unity in an organical body, whether natural or political, without a principle of unity on which all the members must hang, and from which, being separated, they must cease to be members; and who so fit for being this principle of unity to a Church, as he who was *pastor*, *ruler*, *governour*, *captain*, *head*, *judge*, *Christ's vicar*, &c., in relation to that Church? This was the true foundation of that other maxim which I insisted on before, viz.—that there could be but one Bishop at once in a Church? Why so? Why? Because it was monstrous for one body to have two heads; for one society to have two principles of unity.

[1] Ὅσοι γὰρ Θεοῦ εἰσίν καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὗτοι μετὰ τοῦ ἐπισκοπου εἰσιν. Καὶ ὅσοι ἂν μετανοήσαντες ἔλθωσιν ἐπι την ἑνότητα της ἐκκλησίας οὗτοι Θεοῦ ἔσονται, ἵνα ὦσιν κατα Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ζῶντες. P. 40.—[Ed. Oxon. p. 27.—E.]

[2] Οὐ δὲ μερισμὸς ἐστὶν καὶ ὀργὴ, Θεὸς οὐ κατοικει. Πᾶσιν οὖν μετανοοῦσιν ἀφίει ὁ Κύριος, ἐὰν μετανοὴσωσιν εἰς ἑνότητα Θεοῦ καὶ συνέδριον τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου. P. 43.—[Ed. Oxon. p. 29.—E.]

[3] Ἐπεὶ οὖν την πολυπληθίαν ὑμων, ἐν ὀνόματι Θεοῦ ἀπειλήφα ἐν Ὀνησίμῳ τῳ ἐν ἀγάπῃ ἀδιηγήτῳ, ὑμων δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ Ἐπισκόπῳ. P. 17.

[4] Καθώς ἐδήλωσεν μοι Πολύβιος ὁ Ἐπίσκοπος ὑμων—Ὥστε με τὸ πᾶν πλῆθος ὑμων ἐν αὐτῷ θεωρῆσα. P. 47.—[Ed. Oxon. p. 31.—E.]

If what I have said does not satisfy you, though, in all conscience, it ought, it being scarcely possible to prove any thing of this nature more demonstratively, then be pleased only to consider the necessary connexion that is betwixt this principle and that which I am next to prove; and that is,

Secondly, That by the principles of those times, a Bishop, canonically promoted, was supreme in his Church, immediately subject to Jesus Christ, independent on any, unaccountable to any earthly ecclesiastical superiour. There was *no universal Bishop then, under Jesus Christ, who might be the supreme visible head of the Catholick visible Church.* There was indeed an universal Bishoprick, but it was not holden by any one single person. There was an *unus Episcopatus*, one Episcopacy, one Episcopal office, one Bishoprick, but it was divided into many parts; and every Bishop had his share of it assigned him, to rule and govern with the plenitude of the Episcopal authority.[1] There was "one Church all the world over, divided into many members; and there was one Episcopacy diffused in proportion to that one Church, by the harmonious numerosity of many Bishops."[2] Or, if you would have it in other words, the one Catholick Church was divided into many precincts, districts, or dioceses, call them as you will: each of those districts had its singular Bishop, and that Bishop, within that district, had the supreme power. He was subordinate to none but the Great Bishop of Souls, Jesus Christ, the only Universal Bishop of the Universal Church. He was independent on, and stood collateral with all other Bishops. There is nothing more fully, or more plainly, or more frequently insisted on by St Cyprian, than this great principle. I shall only give you a short view of it from him and his contemporaries. And,

1. He lays the foundation of it in the parity which our Lord instituted amongst his Apostles. "Christ," says he, "gave equal power to all his Apostles when he said, 'As

[1] Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur. Cyp. de Un. Eccl. p. 108.

[2] Et cum sit a Christo una Ecclesia per totum mundum in multa membra divisa item Episcopatus unus, Episcoporum multorum concordi numerositate diffusus, &c. Ep. 55, p. 112.

my Father hath sent me, even so I send you, receive ye the Holy Ghost,' "[1] &c. And again, "The rest of the Apostles were the same that St Peter was, endued with an equality of power and honour."[2] Now St Cyprian, on all occasions, makes Bishops successors to the Apostles, as perchance I may prove fully hereafter. Thus, I say, he founds the equality of Bishops, and, by consequence, every Bishop's supremacy within his own Diocese. And agreeably, he reasons most frequently. I shall only give you a few instances.

2. Then, in that excellent epistle to Antonianus, discoursing concerning the case of the lapsed, and shewing how, upon former occasions, different Bishops had taken different measures about restoring penitents to the peace of the Church, he concludes with this general rule—"That every Bishop, so long as he maintains the bond of concord, and preserves Catholic unity, has power to order the affairs of his own church, as he shall be accountable to God."[3] Plainly importing that no Bishop can give laws to another, or call him to an account for his management. To the same purpose is the conclusion of his epistle to Jubianus, about the baptism of hereticks and schismaticks. "These things, most dear brother," says he, "I have written to you as I was able, neither prescribing to, nor imposing on any man, seeing every Bishop hath full power to do as he judges most fitting,"[4] &c. The same way he concludes his epistle to Magnus, concerning the same case of Baptism performed by hereticks.[5] To the same purpose is the whole strain of his epistle to Florentius Pupianus.[6] And what can be more

[1] Et quamvis Apostolis omnibus *parem* potestatem tribuat et dicat, &c. Un. Eccl. p. 107.

[2] Hoc erant utique cæteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, *pari consortio* prædíti et honoris et potestatis. Ibid. p. 107, 108.

[3] Manente concordiæ vinculo, et perseverante Catholicæ Ecclesiæ individuo sacramento, actum suum disponit et dirigit unusquisque Episcopus, rationem propositi sui Domino redditurus. Ep. 55, p. 110.

[4] Hæc tibi breviter pro nostra mediocritate rescripsimus, frater carissime, nemini præscribentes aut præjudicantes, quo minus unusquisque episcoporum quod putat faciat, habens arbitrii sui liberam potestatem. Ep. 73, p. 209, 210.

[5] Ep. 69, p. 188. [6] Ep. 66.

clear or full than his excellent discourse at the opening of the Council of Carthage, anno 256? More than eighty Bishops met to determine concerning that same matter of baptism administered by hereticks or schismaticks. St Cyprian was præses; and having briefly represented to them the occasion of their meeting, he spoke to them thus:— "It remains, now, that each of us speak his sense freely, judging no man, refusing our communion to no man, though he should dissent from us; for none of us constitutes himself Bishop of Bishops, nor forces his colleagues upon a necessity of obeying by a tyrannical terror; seeing every Bishop is entirely master of his own resolutions, and can no more be judged by others than he can judge others; but we all expect the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who alone hath power of making us governours of his Church, and calling us to an account for our administrations."[1]

3. Neither did the principle hold only in respect of this or the other Bishop, but *all without exception, even the Bishop of Rome*, stood upon a level. And for this we have as pregnant proof as possibly can be desired; for when the schismatical party at Carthage set up Fortunatus as an anti-Bishop, and thereupon sent some of their partisans to Rome to inform Cornelius of their proceedings, and justify them to him, Cyprian wrote to him also, and thus reasoned the case with him—"To what purpose was it for them to go to Rome to tell you that they had set up a false Bishop against the Bishops? Either they continue in their wickedness, and are pleased with what they have done, or they are penitent, and willing to return to the Church's unity: if the latter, they know whither they may return. For seeing it is determined by us all, and withal it is just and

[1] Superest ut de hac ipsa re, singuli quid sentiamus proferamus; neminem judicantes, aut a jure communionis aliquem, si diversum senserit, amoventes. Neque enim quisquam nostrum *Episcopum se Episcoporum* constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit; quando habeat omnis Episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suæ, arbitrium proprium; tamque ab alio judicari non possit, quam nec ipse poterit judicare; sed expectemus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui unus et solus habet potestatem et præponendi nos in ecclesiæ suæ gubernatione et de actu nostro judicandi. [Concil. Carthag. p. 229-230.—E.]

reasonable in itself, that every one's cause should be examined where the crime was committed; and seeing there is a portion of the flock (the Catholick Church) assigned to every Bishop, to be governed by him, as he shall be accountable to God, our subjects ought not to run about from Bishop to Bishop, nor break the harmonious concord which is amongst Bishops by their subtile and fallacious temerity: but every man's cause ought there to be discussed, where he may have accusers and witnesses of his crime,"[1] &c. In which reasoning we have these things plain—1. That, by St Cyprian's principles, every Bishop was judge of his own subjects—of all the Christians who lived within his district. 2. That no Bishop, *no not the Bishop of Rome*, was superiour to another Bishop, nor could receive appeals from his sentences: And, 3. That this independency of Bishops, this unaccountableness of one Bishop to another, as to his superiour, was founded on every Bishop's having his portion of the flock assigned to him, to be ruled and governed by him, as he should answer to God; *i. e.* upon his visible supremacy in his own Church, his being immediately subordinate to God only. To the same purpose he writes to Stephen Bishop of Rome also: For having told him his mind freely concerning those who should return from a state of schism to the unity of the Church, how they ought to be treated, and how received, &c. he concludes thus—"We know that some are tenacious, and unwilling to alter what they have once determined, and that they will needs retain some methods peculiar to themselves, but still with the safety of peace, and concord with their colleagues: in which case we offer violence, we proscribe laws to no man, seeing every Bishop has full liberty in the administra-

[1] Quæ autem causa veniendi et pseudo-Episcopum contra Episcopos factum nuntiandi? Aut enim placet illis quod fecerunt, et in suo scelere perseverant; aut si displicet et recedunt, sciunt quo revertantur. Nam cum statutum sit omnibus nobis, et æquum sit pariter ac justum, uniuscujusque causa illic audiatur, ubi est crimen admissum, et singulis pastoribus portio gregis sit adscripta, quam regat unusquisque et gubernet, rationem sui actus Domino redditurus; oportet utique eos quibus præsumus non circumcursare, nec Episcoporum concordiam cohærentem sua subdola et fallaci temeritate collidere, sed agere illic causam suam, ubi et accusatores habere et testes sui criminis possint. Ep. 59, p. 136.

tion of the affairs of his Church, as he will answer to God.[1] And how do both St Cyprian and Firmilian resent Stephen's extravagance, in threatening to refuse his communion to those who had not the same sentiments with himself about the baptism of hereticks! Let any man read St Cyprian's Epistle to Pompeius, and Firmilian's to St Cyprian,[2] and he may have enough to this purpose. Would you have yet more? Then take a most memorable acknowledgment from the Presbyters and Deacons of Rome. St Cyprian had written to them while the Bishop's chair was vacant, and given them an account of his resolutions about the lapsed, those who had sacrificed to the heathen idols in time of persecution. Now consider how they begin their answer to him. "Although," say they, "a mind that is without checks of conscience, that is supported by the vigour of evangelical discipline, and bears witness to itself that it has squared its actions by the Divine commandments, useth to content itself with God as its only Judge, and neither seeks other men's approbations, nor fears their accusations; yet they are worthy of double praises, who, while they know their conscience is subject to God as its only Judge, do yet desire that their administration should have their brethren's comprobations."[3] So clearly acknowledging St Cyprian's (and by consequence, *every* Bishop's) supremacy within his own district, and his independency, or non-subordination to any other Bishop, that even Rigaltius himself, in his annotations on St Cyprian, though a Papist, confesses it. And no wonder, for,

[1] Cæterum scimus quosdam quod semel imbiberint nolle deponere, nec propositum suum facile mutare, sed salvo inter collegas pacis ac concordiæ vinculo, quædam propria, quæ apud se semel sint usurpata, retinere. Qua in re nec nos vim cuiquam facimus aut legem damus, cum habeat in ecclesiæ administratione voluntatis suæ arbitrium liberum unusquisque præpositus, rationem actus sui Domino redditurus. Ep. 72, p. 197-198.

[2] *Vide* Ep. 74 et 75

[3] Quanquam bene sibi conscius animus, et Evangelicæ disciplinæ vigore subnixus, et verus sibi, in decretis cælestibus testis effectus, soleat solo Deo judice esse contentus, nec alterius aut laudes petere, aut accusationes pertimescere; tamen geminata sunt laude condigni, qui cum conscientiam sciant Deo soli debere se judici, actus tamen suos desiderant etiam ab ipsis suis fratribus comprobari, etc. Ep. inter Cyprianicas 30, p. 56.

4. By the principles of those times every Bishop was "Christ's Vicar" within his own district;[1] had a "primacy" in his own church;[2] managed the "balance of her government";[3] was, by his being Bishop, elevated to the "sublime top of the priesthood";[4] had the "episcopal authority in its vigour";[5] the prelatick power in its "plenitude";[6] "a sublime and Divine power of governing the Church."[7] And "none could be called Bishop of Bishops."[8] Every Bishop was head of his own Church;[9] and she was built upon him in her politick capacity.[10] He, and he only, was her visible judge;[11] and he did not stand subordinate to any visible superior. In short, the constitution of every particular Church in those times was a well tempered monarchy. The Bishop was the monarch, and the presbytery was his senate; all the christians within his district depended on him for government and discipline, and he depended on no man; so that I may fairly conclude this point with that famous testimony of St Jerom's in his epistle to Evagrius, "wherever a Bishop is, whether at Rome or Eugubium, Constantinople, or Rhegium, Alexandria, or Tani, he is of the same merit, and the same priesthood. Neither the power of riches, nor the humility of poverty, maketh a Bishop higher or lower; but they are all successors of the Apostles."[12] 'Tis true indeed, St Jerom

[1] Judex *vice* Christi cogitatur. Ep. 59, p. 129.

[2] Cathedram sibi constituere, et primatum assumere, etc. Ep. 69, p. 184.

[3] Gubernandæ Ecclesiæ Libram tenentes —— Ep. 68, p. 177.

[4] Sacerdotii sublime fastigium. Ep. 55, p. 103.

[5] Cum pro Episcopatus vigore et Cathedræ authoritate haberes potestatem, etc. Ep. 3, p. 5. —— Si ita res est, —— Actum est de Episcopatus vigore. Ep. 59, p. 126.

[6] In solidum. Un. Eccl. p. 108.

[7] Actum est de Ecclesiæ gubernandæ sublimi ac Divina potestate. Cyp. ad Cornel. Ep. 59, p. 126.

[8] Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se Episcoporum constituit. Cyp. in Conc. Carth. p. 229. Nam nec Petrus quem primum Dominus elegit, et super quem ædificavit Ecclesiam suam, cum secum Paulus de circumcisione post modum disceptaret, vindicavit sibi aliquid insolenter, aut arroganter assumpsit, ut diceret se *primatum* tenere. Ep. 71, p. 194, 195.

[9] Ep. 45, p. 86.

[10] Passim. [This seems to be a general reference to the works of St Cyprian.—E.]

[11] Ep. 59, p. 129.

[12] Ubicunque fuerit Episcopus, sive Romæ, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegii, sive Alexandriæ, sive Tanis, ejusdem meriti ejusdem est et sacerdotii. Potentia divitiarum et paupertatis humilitas, vel sub-

lived after the Cyprianic age; but I suppose our author will pretend to own his authority as soon as any father's in the point of Church Government.[1] Let me represent to you only one principle more, which prevailed in the days of St Cyprian; and that is,

Thirdly, That whatever the High Priest among the Jews was to the other Priests and Levites, &c. the Christian Bishop was the same to the presbyters and deacons, &c., and the same honour and obedience was due to him. This was a principle which St Cyprian frequently insisted on and reasoned from. Thus, in his third Epistle, directed to Rogatianus, he tells him, that he had Divine law and warrant for punishing his rebellious and undutiful deacon; and then cites that text, Deut. xvii. 12, 13,—"And the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the priest,—or unto the judge, even that man shall die: And all the people shall hear and fear, and do no more presumptuously;" and confirms it farther, by showing how God punished Corah, Dathan, and Abiram, for rebelling against Aaron, Numb. xvi. 1. And when the Israelites, weary of Samuel's government, asked a king to judge them, the Lord said to Samuel,—"Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto theé; for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them," 1 Sam. viii. 7. Therefore he gave them Saul for a punishment, &c. And when St Paul was challenged for reviling God's High Priest, he excused himself, saying—"He wist not that he was the High Priest." Had he known him to have been so, he would not have treated him so, for it is written,—"Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people," Acts xxiii. 4, 5. And as he goes further on, "Our Lord Jesus Christ, our God, King, and Judge, to the

limiorem vel inferiorem Episcopum non facit. Cæterum omnes Apostolorum successores sunt. Hieron. ad Evagrium.—[Ed. Basil. 1523, tom. 2, p. 334.—E.]

[1] This Father was frequently adduced in those days by the anti-Episcopal controversialists, and as will appear from the "Vindication," Mr Rule laid great stress upon Jerome's famous testimony, "Toto orbe decretum," and about the practice of the Alexandrian Church, as if it favoured the scheme of parity, and proved the late introduction of Episcopal power into the Church.—E.]

very hour of his passion, paid suitable honour to the priests, though they neither feared God nor acknowledged Christ: for when he had cleansed the leper, he bade him go show himself to the priest, and offer his gift," Matth. viii. 4. And at the very instant of his Passion, when he was beaten, as if he had answered irreverently to the High Priest, he uttered no reproachful thing against the person of the priest, but rather defended his own innocence, saying—" If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil; but if well, why smitest thou me?" John xviii. 22, 23. All which things were done humbly and patiently by Him, that we might have a pattern of patience and humility proposed to us; for he taught us to give all dutiful honour to *true* priests, by behaving so towards *false* priests."[1]

Thus St Cyprian reason'd, and these were his arguments for obliging all men, clergy as well as laity, to honour and obey their Bishops. To the same purpose he wrote in his fourth Epistle to Pomponius, concerning some virgins and deacons that lived scandalously. " Let them not think they can be saved," says he, " if they will not obey the Bishops, seeing God says in Deuteronomy," and then he cites Deut. xvii. 12.[2] He insists on the same arguments in his 59th Epistle directed to Cornelius, when he is giving him an account of the rebellion and schismatical practices of Fortunatus and Felicissimus, the one a presbyter, and the other a deacon.[3] He insists on them over again in his 66th Epistle to Florentius Papianus.[4] He insists largely on the argument drawn from the punishment inflicted on Corah and his complices for rebelling against Aaron, and makes it the same very sin in schismaticks who separate from their lawful Bishop, in his 69th Epistle directed to Magnus,[5] and in his 73d Epistle directed to Jubaianus.[6] And Firmilian also, St Cyprian's contemporary, insists on the same argument.[7] Indeed, the names, priest, priesthood, altar, sacrifice, &c. so much used in those times, are a pregnant argument of the notions Christians had then of the Christian Hierarchy's being copied from the Jewish. Neither was it a notion newly started up in St Cyprian's time, for we find

[1] Ep. 3, p. 5, 6. [2] Ep. 4, p. 9. [3] Ep. 59, p. 128.
[4] Ep. 66, p. 156. [5] Ep. 69, p. 183. [6] Ep. 73, p. 201. [7] Ep. 75, p. 255.

it in express terms in that notable Epistle written to the Corinthians by St Clement Bishop of Rome, who was not only contemporary with the Apostles, but is by name mentioned by St Paul as one of his fellow-labourers, "whose names are in the Book of Life," Philip. iv. 3. For he, persuading those Corinthians to lay aside all animosities and schismatical dispositions, and to pursue and maintain unity and peace above all things, proposes to them, as a proper expedient for this, that every man should keep his order and station; and then enumerates the several subordinations under the Old Testament, which sufficiently proves that the Hierarchy was still preserved in the New. His method of reasoning, and the design he had in hand to compose the schisms that arose amongst the Corinthians, make this evident beyond all contradiction, that a Bishop in the Christian Church was no less than the High Priest among the Jews, else he had not argued from the precedents of the Temple to persuade them to unity in the Church. "The High Priest," saith he, "has his proper office, and the Priests have their proper place or station; and the Levites are tied to their proper ministeries; and the layman is bound to his laick performances."[1]

Having thus demonstrated that these were three current and received principles in St Cyprian's time, viz. That a Bishop was the principle of unity to his Church, to all the Christians within his district; that he was supreme in his Church, and had no earthly ecclesiastical superior, and that he was the same amongst Christians, which the High Priest was amongst the Jews; let me try a little if our author's definition of a Bishop, in St Cyprian's time, can consist with them. I am afraid it can consist with none of them *singly*, much less with all three together.

1. Not with the first; for if a Bishop *then*, was the principle of unity to a Church, in which there were many presbyters, as Cyprian, *e. g.* was to the Church of Carthage, and Cornelius to the Church of Rome, and Fabius to the

[1] Τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ ἴδίαι λειτουργίαι δεδόμεναι εἰσὶ, καὶ τοῖς; ἰερεῦσιν ἴδιος ὁ τόπος προστέταχται, καὶ λευίταις ἴδίαι, διακονίαι ἐπίκεινται: ὁ λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προστάγμασιν δέδεται. Clem. Epist. ad Cor. p. mihi, 53.—[Cotler. Pat. p. 176. Ed. Amstelod. 1724.—E.]

Church of Antioch, and Dionysius to the Church of Alexandria, &c.; if thus it was, I say, then, to be sure, a Bishop was another thing than a mere single presbyter of a single parish in the presbyterian sense; for if a single presbyter could have been the principle of unity to a Church in which there were *e. g.* forty-six single presbyters, he must have been it as a single presbyter, or as something else; not as a single presbyter, for then there should have been as many principles of unity in a Church as there were single presbyters; for instance, there should have been forty-six principles of unity in the Church of Rome; which, besides that it is plainly contradictory to the notion of one Bishop at once in a Church, what is it else than to make a Church such a monster as may have forty-six heads? Than by so multiplying the principles of unity, to leave no unity at all? Than, instead of one principle of unity to an organized body, to set up forty-six principles of division? Indeed, what is it else than the very extract of nonsense, and cream of contradiction? A single presbyter, then, if he could have been the principle of unity to such a Church, must have been it as something else than a mere single presbyter. But what could that something else have been? A Presbyterian Moderator? Not so neither; for by what propriety of speech can a Moderator of Presbytery, as such, be called the principle of unity to a Church? How can he be called the principle of unity to a Church, who, as such, is neither pastor, head, nor governour of a Church? who, as such, has no direct, immediate, or formal relation to a Church? who, as such, is only the chairman, the master-speaker, not of the Church, but of the Presbytery? Nay, who may be such, and yet no christian? For however inexpedient or indecent it may be, that an heathen should, on occasion, be the Moderator,[1] *i. e.* the master-speaker of a Presbytery, yet it implies no repugnancy to any principle of Christianity. But however this is, it is certain, that according to the Presbyterian principles, (not the Moderator, but) the Presbytery is the principle of unity to the Church, or rather Churches, within the bounds of that Presbytery. And to do our author

[1] [*Vide* "Vindication," cap. 1, sec. 62, where the author expresses his wish that these words had been amended.—E.]

justice, he seems to have been sensible of this, as I observed already; and therefore, he said not, "if he" (the apologist) "can prove, that we separate from our pastors, or from the Moderator of the Presbytery, but from our pastors, or from the Presbytery with their Moderator." Neither,

2. Can our author's definition consist with the second principle, viz. that every Bishop was supreme in his church, independent, and not subordinate, to any Ecclesiastical superiour on earth. To have such a supremacy, such an independency, such an unaccountableness, is notoriously inconsistent with the idea of either a single presbyter, or a Presbyterian Moderator. How can it be consistent with the idea of a single presbyter acting in parity with his brethren presbyters, that of forty-six, for example, one should have a "primacy," a "supremacy," a "plenitude of power," the "sublime and Divine power of governing the Church," an "unaccountable and eminent power," as St Jerom himself calls it.[1] And all the rest should be accountable and subordinate to him? What is this but reconciling contradictions? Besides, the independency of single presbyters is notoriously inconsistent with the Presbyterian scheme. It is independency, not Presbytery. And as for the Presbyterian Moderator, in what sense can he be called supreme or independent, or unaccountable? In what sense can he be said to be raised to the sublime top of the priesthood? or to have an *exors potestas*, "*an unaccountable power?*" or to be accountable to God only? or to have the sublime and Divine power of governing the Church? Is he, as such, raised to the sublime top of the priesthood, who, as such, may be no priest at all? For why may not a ruling elder be a Moderator? How can he be said to have an unaccountable power, who can be voted out of his chair with the same breath with which he was voted into it? How can he be said to be accountable to God only, who is accountable to the Presbytery? How can he be said to have the sublime and Divine power of governing the Church, who, as such, is no Church governor? Has he a supreme power in a society, who, as such, has no imaginable jurisdiction over any one member of that society?

[1] Exors quædam et ab omnibus eminens potestas.

3. But what shall I say to the consistency of our author's definition with the third principle I named? Even no more than that I have proved it to have been one of St Cyprian's, and one that was generally received in his time; and that I can refer it to our author himself to determine, whether the High Priest of the Jews bore no higher character than that of a single Presbyter, or a Presbyterian Moderator? And so I proceed to another head of arguments, which shall be,

Fourthly, To give you, in a more particular detail, some of the branches of the Episcopal prerogative in St Cyprian's time. And I think I shall do enough for my purpose, if I shall prove these three things:—

I. That there were several considerable acts of power relating to the government and discipline of the Church which belonged solely to the Bishop—several powers lodged in his person, which he could manage by himself, and without the concurrence of any other Church governour.

II. That in every thing relating to the government and discipline of the Church, he had a negative over all the other Church governours within his district. And,

III. That all the other clergymen within his district, presbyters as well as others, were subject to his authority, and obnoxious to his discipline and jurisdiction.

I. I say there were several considerable acts of power relating to the government and discipline of the Church which belonged solely to the Bishop—several powers lodged in his person, which he could manage by himself, and without the concurrence of any other Church governour. Take these for a sample. And,

First, He had the sole power of confirmation—of imposing hands on Christians, for the reception of the Holy Ghost after Baptism. For this we have St Cyprian's most express

testimony in his Epistle to Jubaianus, where he tells it was the custom "to offer such as were baptized to the Bishops, that by their prayers, and the laying on of their hands, they might receive the Holy Ghost, and be consummated by the sign of our Lord," *i. e.* by the sign of the Cross, as I take it; and he expressly founds this practice on the pattern of St Peter and St John, mentioned Acts viii. 14, &c.[1] Firmilian is as express in his Epistle to Cyprian, saying in plain language "that the Bishops, who govern the Church, possess the power of baptism, confirmation, and ordination."[2] It is true he calls them *majores natu*, elders, but that he meant Bishops, as distinguished from Presbyters, cannot be called into question by any man who reads the whole Epistle, and considers his stile all along, and withal considers what a peculiar interest, by the principles of these times, the Bishop had in these three acts he names. But whatever groundless altercations there may be about his testimony, as there can be none about St Cyprian's, so neither can there be any shadow of pretext for any about Cornelius's, who, in his Epistle to Fabius, (so often mentioned before), makes it an argument of Novatianus his incapacity of being a Bishop, that though he was baptized, yet he was not confirmed by the Bishop.[3]

[1] Et idcirco quia legitimum et ecclesiasticum baptisma consecuti fuerant (quos Philippus tinxerat) baptizari eos ultra non oportebat; sed tantummodo quod deerat, id a Petro et Joanne factum est, ut oratione pro eis habita, et manu imposita, invocaretur et infundaretur super eos Spiritus Sanctus: Quod nunc quoque apud nos geritur, ut qui in ecclesia baptizantur, præpositis ecclesiæ offerantur, et per nostram orationem ac manus impositionem, Spiritum Sanctum consequantur, et signaculo Dominico consummentur. Ep. 73, p. 202.

[2] Omnis potestas et gratia in ecclesia est, ubi præsident *majores natu*, qui et baptizandi et manum imponendi et ordinandi possident potestatem. Ep. 75, p. 221.

[3] Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ἴστυχε —— ὃν χρὴ μισταλαμβάνειν κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας κανόνα τῷ τι σφραγισθῆναι ὑπὸ τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ, &c. Apud Euseb. H. E. lib. 6, cap. 43.—[Ed. Col. Allob. c. 35. In the primitive Church there were three ceremonies used in confirmation, the anointing with oil or chrism, the imposition of hands, and the signing with the sign of the Cross, hence called "*signaculum Domini*," or in Greek σφραγὶς. Thus Tertullian, in describing what was done to catechumens from Baptism to the Eucharist, says,—"Caro abluitur, ut anima emaculetur; caro inquitur, ut anima consecretur; caro signatur, ut et anima muniatur; caro manus impositione adumbratur, ut et anima spiritu illuminetur; caro corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur, ut et anima de Deo saginetur." Tertull. de Resur. cap. 8. Until within the last year or two,

Secondly, He had the sole power of ordination, and that of whatsoever clergymen within his district. Ordinations could not be performed without him, but he could perform them regularly, without the concurrence of any other church officer. This has been so frequently and so fully proved by learned men that I need not insist much on it. Forbearing therefore to adduce the testimonies of such as lived after St Cyprian's time, such as Ambrose, Jerom, Chrysostom, &c., I shall confine myself to St Cyprian and his contemporaries. To begin with St Cyprian.

It is true, so humble and condescending he was, that when he was made Bishop, he resolved with himself to do nothing by himself concerning the public affairs of the Church, without consulting not only his clergy, but his people.[1] I call this his own free and voluntary condescension: it was a thing he was not bound to do by any Divine prescript, or any Apostolical tradition, or any Ecclesiastical constitution. His very words import so much,[1] [which you may see on the margin.] And yet, for all that, we find him not only in extraordinary junctures, ordaining without asking the consent of his clergy or people, but still insisting on it as the right of all Bishops, and particularly his own, to promote and ordain clergymen, of whatsoever rank, by himself, and without any concurrence. Thus,

In his 38th Epistle, having ordained Aurelius a lector, he acquaints his presbyters and deacons with it, from the place of his retirement. Now consider how he begins his letter. "In all clerical ordinations, most dear brethren," says he, "I used to consult you beforehand, and to examine the manners and merits of every one with common advice."[2] And then he proceeds to tell them, how that notwithstanding that was his ordinary method, a rule he had observed for the most part, yet, for good reasons, he had not observed it in that instance. In which testimony we have these

the "signing with the Cross" was used by some of the Scottish Bishops at confirmation; but because it scandalized tender consciences which had not been accustomed to it in other places, the ancient usage was abandoned from a principle of charity.—E.]

[1] ——Solus rescribere nihil potui; quando a primordio Episcopatus mei statuerim, nihil sine consilio vestro, et sine consensu plebis, mea privatim sententia gerere. Ep. 14, p. 33.

[2] In ordinationibus dericis fratres carissimi, solem us vos ante consulere, et mores ac merita singulorum communi consilio ponderare. Ep. 38, p. 74.

things evident:—1. That his power was the same as to all ordinations, whether of presbyters or others; for he speaks of them all indefinitely; "In clericus ordinationibus." 2. That he used only to ask the counsel and advice of his clergy about the manners and merits of the person he was to ordain, but not their concurrence in the act of ordination; not one word of that. On the contrary, that they used not to concur, fairly imported in the very instance of Aurelius. 3. That it was entirely of his own easiness and condescension that he consulted them in the matter: he *used* to do it, but needed not have done it; he did it not in that very same case. Which is a demonstration of the truth of what I said before, viz. that his resolution, which he had made when he entered to his Bishoprick, was from his own choice, and absolutely free and voluntary.

We have another remarkable testimony to the same purpose in his 41st Epistle, where he tells that, because of his absence from Carthage, he had given a deputation to Caldonius and Herculanus, two Bishops, and to Rogatianus and Numidicus, two of his presbyters, to examine the ages, qualifications, and merits, of some in Carthage, that he, whose province it was to promote men to Ecclesiastical offices, might be well informed about them, and promote none but such as were meek, humble, and worthy.[1] This, I say, is a most remarkable testimony for our present purpose; for he not only speaks indefinitely of all ranks or orders, without making exceptions, but he speaks of himself in the singular number, as having the power of promoting them; and he founds that power, and appropriates it to himself, upon his having the care of the Church and her government committed to him.

We have a third testimony as pregnant as any of the former, in his 72d Epistle, written to Stephen Bishop of Rome; for, representing to him what the resolution of the African Bishops were concerning such presbyters and deacons as should return from a state of schism to the communion of the Church, he discourses thus.—"By common

[1] ——Cumque ego vos pro me vicarios miserim,—ut ætates eorum, et conditiones, et merita discerneretis; ut jam nunc *Ego, Cui Cura Incumbit* omne optimes nossem, et dignos quoque et humiles et mites, ad Ecclesiasticæ administrationis officia promoverem. Ep. 41, p. 79.

consent and authority, dear brother, we tell you further, that if any presbyters or deacons, who have either been ordained before in the Catholick Church, and have afterwards turned perfidious and rebellious against the Church, or have been promoted by a profane ordination, in a state of schism, by *False Bishops* and anti-Christs, against our Lord's institution—that such, if they shall return, shall only be admitted to lay communion," &c.[1] By which testimony, you may clearly see. 1. That all ordinations of presbyters, as well as deacons, were performed by Bishops, by *true* Bishops in the Catholick Church, and by *false* Bishops in a state of schism. 2. That to ordain presbyters and deacons, was so much, and so acknowledged by (all to be?) the Bishop's work, and peculiar to him, that herein even schismaticks themselves observed the common rule. They found their ordinations were indispensibly to be performed by Bishops, that they might not be obnoxious to the charge of invalidity.

So clear and full is St Cyprian on this head, and not only he, but Firmilian, as I have cited him already. Nay, further yet, our martyr's practice was always suitable and correspondent to these principles. He not only ordained Aurelius a lector, as I have showed, without either the consent or concurrence of his clergy, but also Saturus a lector, and Optatus a sub-deacon, Epist. 29, and Celerinus a lector, Ep. 39, in which we have also a most considerable evidence of the Bishop's power in ordinations, in St Cyprian's discourse concerning Aurelius and Celerinus; for there he tells his presbyters, deacons, and all his people, and tells them in an authoritative style,[2] in the style by which

[1] Addimus plane et conjungimus, frater carissime, consensu et auctoritate communi, ut etiam si qui presbyteri aut diaconi, qui vel in Ecclesia Catholica prius ordinati fuerint, et postmodum perfidi et rebelles contra ecclesiam steterint, vel apud hæreticos a *pseudo-Episcopis* et anti-Christis contra Christi dispositionem profana ordinatione promoti sint, et contra altare unum atque Divinum, sacrificia foris falsa ac sacrilega offerre conati sint; eos quoque hac conditione suscipi cum revertuntur, ut communicent laici, &c. Ep. 72, p. 197.

[2] [It appears to me that Bishop Sage is scarcely borne out in this statement by the Text. There is no doubt of the fact, that in those days Bishops *had the power* of acting independently of their Presbyters, but as our author afterwards admits in the "Vindication," St Cyprian and other Catholic Prelates of those times always made it a point to consult and

superiours used to signifie their will and pleasure to their subjects, with a "be it known to you;" he tells them, "I say, that though he had only ordained these two lectors for the time, because they were but young, yet he had designed them for the Presbyterate, and to sit with him, as soon as their years would allow of it."[1]

And what could be more put to this purpose than that uncontrollable account we have of Novatianus (Novatus?) his promotion to the Presbyterate, which we have in that so often mentioned Epistle written by Cornelius to Fabius of Antioch? There he tells how Novatianus was ordained a presbyter, merely by the favour of the then Bishop of Rome: that all the clergy, and many of the people, opposed it as being unlawful, considering that he had been baptized while on the bed of sickness; and that after much work the Bishop prevailed, and ordained him, promising that he would not make a precedent of it. I refer you to the testimony which I have transcribed faithfully on the margin. Consider it, and tell me if any thing can be more clear than that the Bishop then had the sole power of ordination.[2]

Neither do we read in all St Cyprian's works, or in any

act concurrently with their Clergy: they were not *canonically* bound to do so, but merely considered it expedient to sacrifice some of their inherent authority. In the instances here adduced, St Cyprian, who was at this period in retirement on account of persecution, had deviated from his usual method in ordaining these persons, and I am of opinion that his language in the Epistles quoted is rather apologetical than authoritative. In the one case, he pleads the necessity from the scarcity of Clergy and other reasons; in the other, he dwells upon the high qualifications, and even the supernatural attestations in favour of the new Lector. While it is plain that Cyprian might, according to *Catholic* usage, have ordained these men without caring what his Presbyters thought of his act, and that even if they had been displeased with it, the *validity* of the act would not have been impaired; still, as it was contrary to his *individual* practice, in notifying it authoritatively to the Clergy of Carthage he seems to me to take great pains in explaining the circumstances which led to a deviation from his ordinary rule, *i. e.* "Mores et merita singulorum communi consilio ponderare solemus." Ep. 38, p. 74. *Vide* p. 51, *supra*.—E.]

[1] Cæterum Presbyterii honorem designasse nos illis jam *sciatis* —— sessuris nobiscum, provectis et corroboratis annis suis. Ep. 39, p. 78.

[2] Κατηξιώθε τοῦ Πρεσβυτερίου κατὰ χαρίν τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου τοῦ ἐπιθέντος ἀυτῶ χεῖρας ἐις Πρεσβυτερίου κλῆρον Ὃς διακωλυόμενος ὑπὸ παντός τοῦ κλήρου, ἀλλα και λαικῶν πολλῶν. Ἐπεὶ μὴ ἐξὸν ἦν τὸν επὶ κλίνης διὰ νόσον περιχυθέντα, ὥσπερ καὶ οὗτος, εις κλῆρον τινὰ γενέσθαι; ηξίωσε συγχωρηθῆναι ἀυτῷ τοῦτον μόνον χειροτονῆσαι. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 6, c. 43.—[Ed. Coll. Allob. c. 35.—E.]

monuments of those times, of any concurrence[1] of presbyters with Bishops in any ordinations, and far less that ever presbyters ordained without a Bishop. It is true, we read in St Cyprian's 52d Epistle, that Novatus made Felicissimus a deacon; and I read that several learned men understand it so, as if he had ordained him.[2] And Blondell particularly, because Novatus was nothing but a presbyter, concludes, that this was a notable instance of the power of presbyters in ordinations. But when one reads the whole passage, as St Cyprian hath it, and ponders all things duly, he cannot but think it strange that ever that fancy should have been entertained; for all that St Cyprian says, amounts to no more than this, that Novatus turned a schismatick in the time of persecution, and thereby became another persecution to the Church, and that having thus given himself up to the spirit of schism, he, by his faction and ambition, got Felicissimus made a deacon without either St Cyprian's knowledge or allowance.[3] St Cyprian's words, I say, do not import that Novatus ordained Felicissimus; they import no more than that Novatus his ambition and faction prevailed to get Felicissimus ordained a deacon, though himself did not ordain him. (It is probable he was ordained by some neighbouring Bishop, St Cyprian being then in his secession). And it is as evident as any thing can be made, from what immediately follows, that St Cyprian designed them for no more. For he goes on and tells in that same breath, that Novatus having done so and so at Carthage, went next to Rome, and attempted just the like things there; only with this difference, that as Rome, by its greatness, had the precedency of Carthage, so he attempted greater wickedness at Rome than at Carthage; for he, says Cyprian, "who had made a deacon at Carthage against the

[1] [This, of course, means concurrence (as in the present constitution of our Scottish Church) in the laying on of hands—not the concurrence of advice and consent, which our author expressly asserts to have been the practice of the Cyprianic Age. *Vide* Vindication, cap. 7, sec. 13.—E.]

[2] *Vide* Annal. Cyp. ad ann. 250, sec. 21.

[3] Idem est Novatus—qui quosdam istic ex fratribus ab Episcopo segregavit, qui in ipsa persecutione ad evertendas fratrum mentes alia quædam persecutio nostris fuit. Ipse est qui Felicissimum satellitem suum diaconum, nec permittente me, nec sciente, sua factione et ambitione constituit. Ep. 52, p. 97.

Church, made a Bishop at Rome, meaning Novatianus."[1] Now it is certain that not Novatus, but three Bishops, ordained Novatianus, and, by consequence, that St Cyprian never meant that Novatus ordained Felicissimus. This is irrefragable. But then suppose the worst; suppose Novatus had really ordained Felicissimus, what stress is to be laid on the example of a schismatick? especially when what he did was done schismatically. Antonianus asked of St Cyprian what was Novatianus his heresie? and Cyprian answered, "it was no matter what he taught, seeing he taught in schism."[2] And may we not say with the same reason, that it matters not what Novatus did, seeing what he did was done in schism? One thing indeed we learn from this matter, and that is another argument of the Bishop's peculiar interest in the matter of ordination; for St Cyprian most plainly imputes it to schism, that, without his allowance, Novatus should have presumed to have got Felicissimus ordained a deacon.

One word more: the Bishop's being thus possessed of the sole power of ordination in St Cyprian's time, and his practising suitably, was exactly agreeable to the second of the Canons commonly called of the Apostles, which is "Let a presbyter be ordained by one Bishop, as likewise a deacon and the rest of the Clergy."[3] A Canon, without doubt, universally received then, as Beverigus[4] has fully proved, and a

[1] Et cum sua tempestate Romam quoque ad evertendum ecclesiam navigans similia illic et paria molitus est, a clero portionem plebis avellens, fraternitatis, bene sibi cohærentis et se invicem diligentis, concordiam scindens. Plane, quoniam pro magnitudine sua debeat Carthaginem Roma præcedere, illic majora et graviora commisit. Qui istic adversis ecclesiam diaconum fecerat, illic Episcopum fecit. Ep. 52, p. 97.

[2] Quod vero ad Novatiani personam pertinet: frater carissime, de quo desiderasti tibi scribi, quam hæresin introduxisset, scias nos primo in loco, nec curiosos esse debere quid ille doceat, cum foris doceat. Ep. 55, p. 112.

[3] Πρεσβύτερος ὑπὸ ἑνὸς Ἐ ισκόπου χειροτονείσθω καὶ διάκονος καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ κληρικοί.

[4] [The learned and saintly Dr William Beveridge, Bishop of St Asaph, one of the chief monuments of whose learning and industry is the "Συνοδικόν, or Pandecta Canonum SS. Apostolorum, et Conciliorum ab Ecclesia Græca receptorum; nec non Canonicarum SS. Patrum Epistolarum," &c. In his profound annotations on the above work, the Bishop thus sums up his opinion as to the authority and antiquity of the Apostolical Canons—"Hisce sic præmissis, nostram de Canonum horum antiquitate ac origine sententiam paucis aperiamus. Quanquam enim eos vel ab ipsis Apostolis conscriptos esse, vel Clementi tanquam amanuensi dictatos affirmare non ausim, ne cum Damasceno eos inter canonicos sacrarum

Canon highly agreeable with the then current principles, which I have insisted on already, viz. That a Bishop was the principle of unity, and supreme ecclesiastical magistrate within his district. For what can be more suitable to, or rather more necessary by, all the fundamental rules of society, than that it should belong to the supreme power wherever it is lodged, to promote and give commissions to all inferior officers: it is one of the rights of majesty, and one as intrinsick and unalienable or incommunicable, as any. It is true, a good many years after St Cyprian's time it was appointed by the Canons[1] that presbyters should concur with the Bishop in the ordination of presbyters; but then I say, it was many years after St Cyprian's time, and it was for new emergent reasons, that ordinations might be performed more deliberately, or with the greater solemnity, or so, but it is evident that nothing of the substantial validity of the orders were to depend upon it. And so much at present for the Bishop's power of ordination. But this is not all. For,

Thirdly, He had full power, without asking the consent or concurrence of either clergy or people, to settle presbyters within his district. Of this we have a most remarkable instance of St Cyprian's planting Numidius a presbyter of the city of Carthage; our Martyr wrote to his presbyters, deacons, and people, to receive him as such, (probably he had been ordained before), and there was no more of it; it was instantly done.[2] As we learn from the very next epistle,[3]

scripturarum libros recensendos judicarem; nullus tamen dubito quin a viris Apostolicis, hoc est, secundo labente et ineunte tertio a Christi nativitate seculo constituti passim deinceps innotuerint. Hoc enim non ex eo tantum liquet, quod quarto demum currente seculo pro antiquis habiti fuerunt, sed ex inde præcipui quod secunda tertiaque fluente a Verbo Incarnato centuriâ, omnes, vel plerosque saltem (a quibus et de cæteris facile esse conjecturam facere) in Ecclesiâ Christiana obtinuisse, ex Clementi Alexandrino, Origine, Tertulliano, aliisque ejusdem ætatis scriptoribus et Ecclesiasticis historiis abunde constet. "Bev. Pandectæ Can. Tom. 2. Annotationes pag. 4." Item Prolegom, Tom. 1, p. 3, 4, where a similar opinion is recorded.—E.]

[1] [By the Canons of the 4th Council of Carthage, A. D. 436, it is enjoined, that "Presbyteri quam ordinatur, Episcopo eum benedicente et manum super caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes Presbyteri, qui præsentes sunt manus suas juxta manum Episcopi super caput ejus teneant." Binii Con. Tom. 1, p. 588. Concil. Carthag. 4, c. 3.

[2] Ep. 40. [3] Ep. 41, et 43.

where we find the same Numidicus, as a Presbyter of Carthage, receiving a commission for a deputation to oversee such and such things in St Cyprian's absence. So negligent shall I say? or so ignorant was St Cyprian of "Christ's Testament," at least of his leaving in it to his people, by way of legacy, a right, a grant, a privilege of choosing their own ministers?[1] What a stranger has he been to all the analogies and principles of presbyterian government! But I proceed.

Fourthly, In St Cyprian's time the Bishop had the disposal of all the revenues of the Church. All the Churches' incomes then were oblations and charitable contributions. The civil magistrate was heathen, and treated her commonly with persecutions, never with encouragements. Now, the Bishop, I say, had the full power of disposing of these contributions and oblations.

In the first place, he had his own *quantitas propria*, his proper portion, and it was, no doubt, a considerable one; it is commonly reckoned to have been the third; the other two belonged to the Clergy and the poor, but so as to be dispensed by the Bishop.

That he had his own portion, and that a liberal one, is evident from his seventh Epistle; for there he tells how, before he retired, he gave the trust of it to Rogatianus, one of his Presbyters, ordering that if there were any necessitous strangers at Carthage, they should have maintenance out of it.[2] And it is observable that when St Cyprian gives an account of Fortunatianus, who had been Bishop of Assuræ, but had forfeited by sacrificing in time of persecution, and yet was earnest for all that to retain his Bishoprick, he says expressly, that "it was upon the account of the perquisites,

[1] [The Scotch Presbyterians have always insisted strongly on this point, and the language here quoted by Bishop Sage is that which their popular preachers and speakers employ, when alluding to it. Of late years this language has been revived, and the sounds of "Christ's Crown," "Christ's Testament," "Right of Popular Election," "Sin of Erastianism," "Patronage," &c., the well known watch-words of the Covenanting Party, have been perpetually ringing in our ears, and have produced no small disturbance and strife throughout, what used to be regarded, the quiet and flourishing Scottish Establishment.—E.]

[2] Sed et peregrinis, si qui indigentes fuerint, sumtus suggeratis, de quantitate mea propria, quam apud Rogatianum compresbyterum nostrum dimisi. Ep. 7, p. 14.

and not from any love to religion."[1] And it is not to be doubted that the same reason moved Basilides to be so much concerned for the recovery of his Bishoprick, after he had forfeited it also.[2] Indeed, the Bishop's proper portion was settled upon him by the fortieth of the Apostolic Canons.

And that he had the disposal of the rest, particularly that which belonged to the Clergy, is as plain. For, in his forty-first Epistle, he makes it an aggravation of Felicissimus's guilt, that "contrary to the duty which he owed to his Bishop, he should have made such a clutter about the division of the contributions." And on the other hand, he praises the dutifulness of others, who would not follow Felicissimus his bad example, but continued in the unity of the Church, and "were satisfied to take their shares, as the Bishop should please to dispense them."[3] And it is a most remarkable instance of this his power, which we have in the aforementioned case of Aurelius and Celerinus; for though he promoted them only to the degree of Lectors, yet he entituled them to the maintenance of Presbyters.[4] And as for that part that belonged to the poor, his power in the distribution of it is so evident from his fifth and forty-first Epistles, that I need not insist upon it. Indeed, this power was expressly asserted to them by the thirty-eighth and forty-first of the Apostolick Canons.[5] And we find Bishops in possession of it long before St Cyprian's time, as is evident from Justin Martyr's second Apology, not far from the end, not now to mention that it seems fairly to be founded on express Scripture.[6] Indeed,

[1] Stipes et oblationes et lucra desiderant, quibus prius insatiabiles incubabant, et cœnis atque epulis etiam nunc inhiant, quarum crapalum nuper superstite indies cruditate ructabant; nunc manifestissime comprobantes, nec ante se religioni, sed ventri potius et quæstui profana cupiditate servisse. Ep. 65, p. 163.

[2] *Vide* Ep. 67, p. 173.

[3] Cumque post hæc omnia, nec loci mei honore motus —— In quo quidem gratulor plurimos fratres ab hac audacia recesisse, et vobis acquiescere maluisse, ut cum ecclesia matre remanerent, et stipendia ejus *episcopo dispensante* perciperent. Ep. 41, p. 80.

[4] Cæterum Presbyterii honorem designasse nos illis jam sciatis, ut et sportulis iisdem cum Presbyteris honorentur, et divisiones mensurnas æquatis quantitatibus partiantur. Ep. 38, p. 78.

[5] Πάντων των ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πραγμάτων, ὁ Ἐπισκόπος ἐχέτω την φροντίδα, &c. C. Ap. 38.

[6] *Vide* Clariss. Dodwell. Dissert. Cyp. 1. Sect. 9.

Fifthly, He seems to have had a power of imposing charitable contributions on all the christians within his district, for the relief of distressed strangers, whether captives, prisoners, or condemned to the mines or galleys, &c. Of this power we have famous instances in his sixty-second and seventy-seventh Epistles. You may consult them at your leisure. And long before St Cyprian's time Soter Bishop of Rome, as the venerable Dionysius Bishop of Corinth, (cited for it by Eusebius), tell us, managed this power to excellent purpose, as his predecessors, from the Apostles' times, had done before him. Take his own words, for he was a very ancient father, having flourished about an hundred years before St Cyprian. They are in an epistle of his to the Church of Rome, in which he thus bespeaks them.—"This has been your custom from the beginning (*i. e.* ever since the Church of Rome was planted), to do manifold good offices to the brethren, and send supplies to most Churches in most cities, for sweetening their poverty, and refreshing those that are condemned to the mines. You, Romans, observe the custom of the Romans handed down to you by your fathers, which custom your blessed Bishop Soter has not only observed, but improved,"[1] &c. What can be more clear than it is from these words, that Soter, as Bishop of Rome, had the chief management of the charitable contributions, imposing them, and disposing of them for the relief of the afflicted christians of whatsoever Church? And now that I have gone higher than St Cyprian's time, (though it was not necessary for my main argument, and to make use of it might swell this letter to too great a bulk), let me mention another power which Tertullian (who lived before St Cyprian also), in plain terms appropriates to the Bishop, a considerable power, a power that is a considerable argument of the Episcopal sovereignty. And it is,

Sixthly, The power of indicting solemn fasts, as occasion required, to all the Christians within his district. You have his words, plain and home, (upon the margin.)[2]

[1] Euseb. H. E. l. 4, c. 23.—[Ed. Col. Allob. c. 22.—E.]

[2] Bene autem et quod Episcopi universæ plebi mandare jejunia assolent: non dico de industria stipium conferendarum, ut vestræ capturæ est; sed interdum ex aliqua solicitudinis ecclesiasticæ causa. [Tert. de Jejun. cap. 13. Ed Rigalt.—E.]

Seventhly, A Bishop in St Cyprian's time, (for now I return to it), as such, had the sole power of convocating his Presbyters and Deacons—all those of his Clergy and people who either sat with him, or standing, gave their suffrages, as they were asked, about anything relating to the Church. All learned men (even Spanhemius himself, our author's diligent searcher into antiquity[1]), confesses (confess?) this. Indeed this was a point on which the unity of the Church did so much depend, that it could not but be a necessary branch of his prerogative, who was the principle of unity to, and was intrusted with, the supreme government of the Church. And, agreeably, we find Cornelius accounting about it in an Epistle to Cyprian. For there he tells how the Presbyters and Confessors who had sided with Novatianus, turning sensible of their error, came (not straight to himself, for it seems they had not the confidence to do that, or rather, they would not have been allowed that freedom so suddenly, but) to his Presbyters, acknowledging their offences, and humbly supplicating that they might be pardoned, and their escapes forgotten; how when all this was narrated to him he was pleased to convocate the Presbytery; how Maximus, Urbanus, Sidonius, and Macarius, being allowed to appear, made their acknowledgments and humble addresses; and then, how after they were received in the Presbytery, the whole matter was communicated to the people, and they again renewed their acknowledgments before the people, confessing, as I shewed before, viz.—" That they were convinced that Cornelius was chosen by the Omnipotent God and our Lord Jesus Christ, to be Bishop of the most holy Catholick Church; and that they were not ignorant that as there was but one God, one Christ our Saviour, and one Holy Ghost, so there ought to be only one Bishop in a Catholick Church.[2] Here, I say, was a noble instance of a

[1] *Vide supra*, p. 6.

[2] ——Omni igitur actu ad me perlato, placuit contrahi Presbyterium—— His ita gestis in Presbyterium venerunt—Summis precibus desiderantes ut ea, quæ ante fuerant gesta, in oblivionem cederent——Quod erat consequens, omnis hic actus populo fuerat insinuandus, ut et ipsos viderent in ecclesia constitutos——Magnus fraternitatis concursus factus est.——Una vox erat omnium gratias Deo agentium——Et ut ipsorum propria verba designem; Nos inquiunt Cornelium Episcopum sanctissimæ ecclesiæ, &c. Ep. 49, p. 92, 93.

Bishop's power in convocating his Presbyters at pleasure, and managing the affairs of the Church like a Chief Governor. The whole epistle is well worth perusing. But I shall only desire you to take notice of one thing by the way, it is, that Cornelius sought not the *people's consent* for their reception; no, he first received them again into the communion of the Church, and then acquainted the people with it. I observe this, because it is another demonstration that what St Cyprian determined from the beginning of his Episcopacy, was merely the effect of his own choice and arbitrary condescension, viz. to do nothing without his people's consent. This, I say, was not a thing he was bound to do by the rules of his Episcopacy, for then Cornelius had been as much bound as he.

After these persons were so solemnly reconciled to the Church, they themselves, by a letter, gave an account of it to St Cyprian; an account, I say, which might bring more light to the whole matter, if it needed any. "We are certain," say they, "most dear brother, that you will rejoice with us when you know that all mistakes are forgotten, and we are reconciled to Cornelius *our Bishop*, and to all the Clergy, to the great contentment and good liking of the whole Church."[1]

But you may say, did not the Roman Presbytery convene during the vacancy, after the death of Fabianus? and did not the Presbytery of Carthage meet frequently during the time of St Cyprian's secession? How then can it be said that the Bishop had the sole power of convocating Presbyters? I answer, it is true, it was so in both cases; but how? To begin with the latter. There was no meeting of the clergy at Carthage during St Cyprian's secession without his authority; and therefore we find when he retired, he left a delegated power with his Presbyters and Deacons, or an allowance, call it as you will, to meet and manage the affairs of the Church as occasion should require, but still so as that they could do nothing of moment without first consulting him, and nothing but what was of ordinary incidence,

[1] Certi sumus, frater carissime, te quoque nobiscum pari voto congaudere, nos habito consilio, utilitatibus ecclesiæ et paci magis consulentes, omnibus rebus prætermissis, et judicio Dei servatis, cum Cornelio *Episcopo nostro* pariter et cum universo clero pacem fecisse, cum gaudio etiam universæ ecclesiæ, prona etiam omnium caritate. Ep. 53, p. 98.

is (or?) regulated by the Canons. This we learn from many of his Epistles: Thus, in his fifth Epistle directed to his Presbyters and Deacons, because he could not be present himself, he required them "faithfully and religiously to discharge both his office and their own."[1] Which not only imports that they had distinct offices from his, but also, in express terms, settles a delegation on them. He bespeaks them after the same manner in his twelfth epistle.[2] And more authoritatively yet, Epistle fourteen, where he not only exhorts, but "commands them to perform the office of vicars to him."[3] But then how warmly he resented it, when some of them ventured beyond the limits of the allowance he had given them; when they began to encroach on his prerogatives; when they presumed to meddle in matters for which they had no allowance, and which were not in the common road, nor regulated by the Canons, you shall hear to purpose by and by. And from what I have already said, the other case, that of the Presbytery's meeting in the time of a vacancy, may be easily cleared also; for though they might meet, yet all they could do was to provide all they could for the peace and safety of the Church, by determining in *ruled* cases; just as may be done by inferior magistrates in all other corporations or societies, in the time of an interreign, but they could make no new rules; and there were several other things they could not do, as I shall also shew fully within a little. In the meantime, having mentioned how St Cyprian, in his absence, gave a delegation to his Clergy, and constituted them his vicars, let me give you one example of it, which may well deserve to pass for another instance of acts that were peculiar to himself; and that is,

Eighthly, His delegating, not his Presbyters in common, but two of them only, viz. Rogatianus and Numidicus, with two Bishops, Caldonius and Herculanus, not only to consider the state of the poor, and of the clergy at Carthage,

[1] Et quoniam mihi interesse nunc non permittit loci conditio; peto vos pro fide et religione vestra, fungamini illic et vestris partibus et meis. Ep. 5, p. 10.

[2] Atque utinam loci et gradus mei conditio permitteret, ut *ipse* nunc præsens esse possem——Sed officium *meum* vestra diligentia representet. Ep. 12, p. 27.

[3] Hortor et mando——vice mea fungamini. Ep. 14, p. 31.

but to pronounce *his* sentence of excommunication against Felicissimus and Augendus, and all that should join themselves to that faction and conspiracy.[1] Which delegation was accordingly accepted of, and the sentence put in execution, as we learn by the return which these four delegates, together with another Bishop called Victor, made to our holy martyr.[2] I might have easily collected more instances of powers and faculties which were peculiar to a Bishop in St Cyprian's time, and which could not be pretended to by presbyters; but these may be sufficient for a sample, especially considering that more, perhaps, may be discovered in the prosecution of the next thing I promised to make appear, which was,

II. That in every thing relating to the government and discipline of the Church, the Bishop had a negative over all the other Church Governours within his district. He had the supreme power of the keys. No man could be admitted into the Church; no man could be thrust out of the Church; none excommunicated could be admitted to penance, nor absolved, nor restored to the communion of the Church; no Ecclesiastical law could be made, nor rescinded, nor dispensed with, without him. In short, all Ecclesiastical discipline depends upon the Sacraments, and neither Sacrament could be admitted without his allowance. If this point, well proved, does not evince that a Bishop in St Cyprian's time was a real Prelate, and stood in a real superiority above all other Church officers, I must despair of ever proving any thing; and I must despair of ever proving any thing, if I prove not this point.

1. To begin with Baptism, the Sacrament by which persons are admitted into the Church—that no man could be baptized without the Bishop's consent, has as much evidence as can be well required for any matter of fact. For,

[1] Cum ego vos pro me vicarios miserim——Felicissimus——accipiat sententiam quam prior dixit, ut abstentum se a nobis sciat:——Sed et augendus——sententiam ferat——et quisquis se conspirationi et factioni adjunxerit, sciat se in ecclesia nobiscum non esse communicaturum. Ep. 41, p. 79, 80.

[2] Caldonius cum Herculano et Victore Collegis (*i. e.* Episcopis) item cum Rogatiano et Numidico Presbyteris, Cypriano salutem. Abstinuimus communicatione Felicissimum et Augendum, &c. Ep. 42, p. 81.

First, St Cyprian could not have expressed anything more fully or more plainly than he has done this. To omit that testimony which he gives in his Exhortation to Martyrdom, where he says—"Bishops, by our Lord's allowance, gave the first baptism to believers."[1] Let us turn over to Epistle seventy-three, in which he insists directly to this purpose. The question was, whether baptism, performed by hereticks or schismaticks, was valid? St Cyprian affirmed it was not. His conclusion was such as required some other argument to support it than his own authority. It was therefore needful that he should attempt to prove it, and that from received and acknowledged principles. Now, consider his argument, I shall give it in his own words as near as I can translate them.—"'Tis manifest," says he, "where, and by whom, the remission of sins can be given, which is given in baptism. For our Lord gave first to Peter (on whom he built his Church, thereby instituting and demonstrating the original of unity), that power, that whatsoever he should loose on earth, should be loosed in heaven; and then, after his resurrection, he gave it to all his Apostles, when he said, 'As my Father hath sent me,' &c. (John xx. v. 21, 22, 23.) Whence we learn that none can baptize authoritatively, and give remission of sins, but the *Bishops* and those who are *founded* in the evangelical law and our Lord's Institution; and that nothing can be bound or loosed out of the Church, seeing there's none there who has the power of binding or loosing. Further, dearest brother, we want not divine warrant for it, when we say that God hath disposed all things by a certain law, and a proper ordinance, and that none can *usurp* anything against the *Bishops*, all being subject to them; for Corah, Dathan, and Abiram attempted to assume to themselves a privilege of sacrificing against Moses, and Aaron the Priest, and they were punished for it, because it was unlawful."[2] Thus St Cyprian argued; and

[1] Nos tantum qui Domino permittente primum baptisma credentibus dedimus. P. 168.

[2] Manifestum est aut ubi et per quos remissa peccatorum dari potest, quæ in Baptismo scilicet datur. Nam Petro primum Dominus, super quem ædificavit ecclesiam, et unde unitatis originem instituit et ostendit; potestatem istam dedit, ut id solveretur in cœlis, quod ille solvisset in terris. Et post resurrectionem quoque ad Apostolos loquitur, dicens, "*sicut misit me Pater*," &c.——Unde intelligimus non nisi in ecclesia præpositis, et in evangelica lege ac Dominica ordinatione fundatis licere baptizare et re-

the force of his argument lies visibly in this, that baptism performed by hereticks or schismaticks cannot be valid, because not performed by the Bishop, nor with his allowance. Now, whatever comes of his inference, sure it had been ridiculous in him to have so reasoned, if his antecedent had not been a received principle.

Neither was St Cyprian singular in this, for Firmilian Bishop of Cæsarea in Capadocia is as plain, saying, (as I have cited him before),[1] "that the Bishops who govern the Church, possess the power of baptism, confirmation, and ordination." And Fortunatus, Bishop of Thuchaboris, another of St Cyprian's contemporaries, in his suffrage at the Council of Carthage, is as plain as either Cyprian or Firmilian. Jesus Christ," says he, "our Lord and God, the Son of the Father and Creator, built his Church upon a rock, and not upon heresie, and gave the power of baptizing to Bishops and not to hereticks," &c.[2] Indeed, before St Cyprian's time we have Tertullian, who spent most of his time in the second century, and who, in his Book about Baptism, against Quintilla, to the question, who may baptize? answers positively—"The High Priest, who is the Bishop, hath the power of baptizing, and after him, or in subordination to him, Presbyters and Deacons, but not without the *Bishop's authority*.[3] And before him we have the apostolical Ignatius, who spent almost all his days in the first century, and who says in express terms—"that it is not lawful to baptize without the Bishop."[4]

missam peccatorum dare; foris autem nec ligari aliquid posse nec solvi, ubi non sit qui aut ligare possit aliquid, aut solvere. Nec hoc, frater carissime, sine scripturæ divinæ auctoritate proponimus, ut dicamus certa lege ac propria ordinatione divinitus cuncta esse disposita; nec posse quenquam contra Episcopos et sacerdotes usurpare sibi aliquid, quod non sit sui juris et potestatis; nam et Chore et Dathan et Abyron, contra Moysen et Aaron Sacerdotem sacrificandi sibi licentiam usurpare conati sunt: nec tamen quod illicite ausi sunt impune fecerunt. Ep. 73, p. 201.

[1] *Supra*, p. 50.

[2] Jesus Christus Dominus et Deus noster, Dei Patris et Creatoris Filius, super petram ædificavit ecclesiam suam, non super hæresin; et potestatem baptizandi Episcopis dedit, non hæreticis: quare qui extra ecclesiam sunt, et contra Christum stantes, oves ejus et gregem spargunt, baptizari non possunt. Conc. Carth. Suff. 17.

[3] Dandi quidem jus habet *summus sacerdos*, qui est Episcopus; dehinc Presbyteri et Diaconi, non tamen sine Episcopi auctoritate. Cap. 17.

[4] Οὐκ ἐξὸν ἐστιν χωρὶς τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου οὔτε βαπτίζειν, &c. Ad Smyrn. p. 6.—[Ed. Oxon. p. 5.—E.]

2. A Bishop, in St Cyprian's time, had as much power about the Holy Eucharist. No Presbyter within his district could administer it without his leave, or against his interdict. St Cyprian's testimonies to this purpose are innumerable. Let me give you only one or two, for instance. Thus in his sixteenth Epistle written to his Presbyters and Deacons, he resents it highly that some of his Presbyters should have dared to admit the lapsed to the Sacrament without his allowance. "Such," says he, "deny me the honour of which by divine right I am possessed," &c. Indeed, the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth Epistles are to this purpose.[1] And in his fifty-ninth Epistle, having cited Mal. ii. v. 1, 2, he reasons thus against all such Presbyters as presumed to celebrate the Eucharist without the Bishop's allowance—"Is glory given to God when his Majesty and discipline is so contemned, that, when He says, He is angry and full of wrath against such as sacrifice to idols, and when He threatens them with everlasting pains and punishments, sacrilegious persons should presume to say, think not on the wrath of God; fear not the divine judgments; knock not at the Church of Christ; that they should cut off repentance, and the confession of sins; and *presbyters contemning* and *trampling on their Bishops*, should preach peace with deceiving words, and give the communion," &c.[2]

And 'tis a passage very remarkable to this purpose, which we read in an Epistle of Dionysius of Alexandria to Fabius of Antioch, (both St Cyprian's contemporaries), in which he tells how one Serapion, an aged man, after a long perseverance in the Christian faith, had first fallen from it in time of persecution, and then into a deadly sickness; how,

[1] Hi sublato honore quem nobis beati martyres—Servant, contemta Domini lege—quam iidem martyres—tenendam mandant—ante reditum nostrum—communicent cum lapsis, et offerant, et Eucharistiam tradant. Ep. 16, p. 38.

[2] Honor ergo datur Deo, quando sic Dei majestas et censura contemnitur, ut cum se ille indignari et irasci sacrificantibus dicat, et cum pœnas æternas et supplicia perpetua comminetur: proponatur a sacrilegis atque dicatur; ne ira cogitetur Dei, ne timeatur judicium Domini; ne pulsetur ad ecclesiam Christi: sed sublata pœnitentia, nec ulla ex omologesi criminis facta, despectis Episcopis atque calcatis, pax a Presbyteris verbis fallacibus prædicetur et—communicatio a non communicantibus offeratur? Ep. 59, p. 135.

after he had been dumb and senseless for some days, recovering some use of his tongue, he called quickly for one of the Presbyters of Alexandria, (for he lived in that city), that he might be absolved, and have the Sacrament, being persuaded he should not die till he should be reconciled to the Church; and how the Presbyter being sick also, sent the Sacrament to him. But by what right or authority? By Dionysius the Bishop. "For," says he, "I had commanded that any lapsed, if in danger of death, especially if he was an humble supplicant for it, should be absolved, that he might go out of this world full of good hopes," &c.[1] He, being Bishop of that city, had given a command for it, otherwise it could not have been done. And all this was nothing more than Ignatius had told the world long before, viz.—"That that is only to be deemed a firm and valid Eucharist, which is celebrated by the Bishop, or by his authority."[2]

Let me only add one testimony more from St Cyprian, concerning both Sacraments; but such an one as ought not to be neglected. It is in his sixty-ninth Epistle written to Magnus. The great purpose he pursues in it is to represent the atrocious guilt of schism, and the forlorn condition of schismaticks, that they cannot have valid Sacraments, and that all their acts are nullities, &c. Amongst many arguments to this effect he insists on that famous one—"Corah, Dathan and Abiram, were of that same religion that Moses and Aaron were of, and served the same God whom Moses and Aaron served; but because they transgressed the limits of their own stations, and usurped a power of sacrificing to themselves in opposition to Aaron the Priest, who was only legally invested with the priesthood by God's vouchsafement and appointment, they were forthwith punished in a miraculous manner; neither could their sacrifices be valid or profitable, being offered unlawfully and irreligiously, and against the divine ordinance." And yet these men had made no schism; they had not departed from the tabernacle, nor raised another altar, &c. which now

[1] Ἐντολῆς δὲ ὑπὸ ἐμοῦ δεδομένης τοῖς ἀπαλλαττομένοις τοῦ βίου, εἰ δέοιντο, καὶ μάλιστα, εἰ καὶ πρότερον ἱκετεύσαντες τύχοιεν, ἀφίεσθαι ἵνα εὐέλπιδες ἀπαλλάττωνται.—Euseb. H. E. lib. 6, cap. 35.—[Ed. Col. Allob. cap. 36.—E.]

[2] Ἐκείνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἡγεῖσθω, ἡ ὑπὸ τὸν Ἐπίσκοπον οὖσα, ἢ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸ ἐπιτρέψῃ. Ign. ad Smyrn. p. 6.—[Ed. Oxon. p. 4.—E.]

the schismaticks do, (meaning the Novatians), who dividing the Church, and rebelling against Christ's peace and unity, are bold to constitute an [Episcopal] Chair, and assume to themselves a primacy, an Episcopal authority, and a "*power* of *Baptizing* and *Offering*," that is, celebrating the Holy Eucharist. What can be more plain than it is here, that no Sacraments could be administered but in dependence on the Bishop?[1] Indeed,

3. Considering that, as I have fully proved, a Bishop was *then* the principle of unity to the Church; that he was chief governour of the Church, and that, by consequence, the supreme power of the keys could not but belong to him; considering that the Church was a visible society; that he was the visible head of that visible society; and by consequence, that it belonged to him as such to take care that society might suffer no detriment; considering these things, I say it was highly reasonable that he should have the chief power of dispensing the Sacraments—such a power as that neither might be dispensed without him. What can be more detrimental to a society, especially such a society as a Christian Church, than admitting unworthy persons to the privileges of it? or allowing them to continue in it? or restoring them to their membership in the society after they have been justly thrust from it, without considering whether they have given any evidences of a serious reformation? And who so proper to judge of these matters as the chief governour of the society? And now,

Having thus made it evident that a Bishop in St Cyprian's time had a negative over all other Church officers within his district in the grand concern of dispensing both Sacraments, and that neither could be administered without him, or against his authority, I might fairly supersede the

[1] Nam et Core, et Dathan, et Abyron, cum sacerdote Aaron et Moyse eundem Deum noverant, pari lege et religione viventes unum et verum Deum, qui colendus atque invocandus fuerat, invocabant. Tamen quia loci sui ministerium transgressi contra Aaron sacerdotem, qui sacerdotium legitimum dignatione Dei atque ordinatione perceperat, sacrificandi sibi licentiam vindicaverunt, divinitus percussi———Nec potuerunt rata esse et proficere sacrificia, irreligiose et illicite contra jus Divinæ dispositionis oblata.———Et tamen illi schisma non fecerant, nec foras egressi——— Quod nunc hi Ecclesiam scindentes, et contra pacem atque unitatem Christi rebelles, cathedram sibi constituere, et primatum assumere, et baptizandi atque offerendi licentiam vindicare conantur. Ep. 69, p. 183, 184.

trouble of making either a minute or a laborious demonstration of his sovereign interest in the acts of excommunication, or injoyning penances, or reconciling penitents, or making, or rescinding, or dispensing with ecclesiastical laws or canons; in a word, in everything relating to the government or discipline of the Church. All these acts depend upon the Sacraments. His negative, therefore, about the dispensation of the Sacraments, had been in vain and to no purpose, if he had not had a negative likewise about all these acts. Besides you will not readily say, I think, that he could have had a *greater trust* by having a negative in any other matter than in the dispensing of the Sacraments. Having that, therefore, he might well be intrusted with a negative in all other things, either of equal (if any such can be imagined), or lesser importance, on which the order, the subsistence, the unity, the peace, the purity, the prosperity, or whatsoever interest of the Church could any way depend. Yet that I may give you all possible satisfaction, I shall proceed a little further, and give you, by way of historical deduction, such an account of powers lodged, *e. g.* in St Cyprian's person, as you may fairly judge thereby concerning the preeminences of Bishops in his time.

The most current account we have about him is, that he was not converted to Christianity, at least not baptized, till the year 246; that he was ordained a Presbyter, anno 247, and Bishop of Carthage, anno 248. Chronologists do generally agree in this last step of his preferment. Now, as we learn both from himself, and from Pontius his deacon, some of the Carthaginian clergy were mighty enemies to his promotion.[1] Belike they took it ill that he, so lately converted to the faith, so lately made a Presbyter, should have been preferred to themselves. However it was, certain it is, as I said, that they appeared against him with all their might and main. But the *people* were so generally and so zealously for him to have him their Bishop, that these his enemies were overpowered. Made Bishop he was; and he was a person so well qualified, so eminent in every virtue, and withal so strict and cautious in his life and government, after he was made Bishop, that it was not easy for

[1] *Vide* Ep. 43, p. 82, et Vit. Cypr. p. 3, postea cit.

the mutineers to wreck their malice on him; but this was so far from softening them, and bringing them to a better temper, that, on the contrary, it imbittered them the more, and made them the more watchful of all opportunities to breed him troubles, and disturb his government. At last they catched hold of one, and that a very dangerous one, in the time of the Decian persecution.

This persecution, beginning towards the end of the year 249, and lasting for a full year, coming on the Church after a long peace, with a surprizing violence, had very sad effects. Vast numbers turned apostates, renouncing the holy faith, and sacrificing to the heathen idols; and Cyprian himself, commanded by God, had retired from Carthage till there should be some relentment of the fury of the persecution. Here, I say, his subtle enemies found their so long wished opportunity; for the lapsed, so soon as the hazard was over, resumed their Christian profession, and turned mighty forward, if not furious, to be restored to the communion of the Church. Though they knew full well that they were bound by the Canons to have continued for a long time in the state of penitents, yet they thought their numbers, and perhaps their qualities, might overpower the Canons, and claim indulgences and dispensations. With them struck in those clergymen who had still retained the old grudges against St Cyprian's promotion, encouraging their presumptions. They knew he was a man of principles, and had a mighty zeal for the real interests of Christianity, and, by consequence, that he would stand resolutely by the Canons of the Church, and be clear that the lapsed should perfect their terms of penance. They saw the eagerness of the lapsed to be sooner reconciled than the Canons allowed; they resolved, therefore, to fall in with them, thinking that thereby they should effectually put a thorn in his foot; they should enflame the lapsed and their relations, perchance the great body of the people against him. But this was not all.

It was not enough for themselves to encourage the lapsed in their petulancies; the Bishop's prelation over Presbyters was then so notorious, that as malicious as they were, they had not impudence enough to set up theirs in opposition to his authority, and reconcile the lapsed to the Church, merely

upon the score of their own credit, against his will and orders; and therefore they fell upon another project. If it was possible for any other to stand up against the Bishop's authority, it was that of the martyrs and confessors: These for their faith and patience, their fervent zeal, and fragrant graces, their glorious courage, and good example, that they might persevere themselves, and others might be encouraged to follow their pattern, were held in mighty reputation. They were reputed as dearer to God, and in a closer communion with him, and nearer approximation to him, than christians of the common size; and their intercessors had been in use of being much regarded in former persecutions. These, therefore, as the only persons whose credit could be feasibly put in the balance with the Bishop's authority, the holy man's supplanters instigated to espouse the quarrel of the lapsed, to become their patrons, for having themselves absolved against the Bishop's resolutions. And truly some of them were so far wrought upon as to turn zealous for it, and, armed with their authority, these discontented Presbyters adventured to absolve the lapsed and receive them to the Sacrament, without the Bishop's allowance. Now consider what followed, and speak your conscience, and tell me if St Cyprian was not more than either single Presbyter or Presbyterian Moderator.

Though he was one of the mildest and most humble men that ever lived, yet so soon as this was told him, where he was in his retirement, he was not a little alarmed. The practice was surprising, and the presumption new, as well as bold; the like had never been done before in any Christian Church; and such preposterous methods clearly tended to shake all the foundations of order and good discipline; and therefore he thought it high time for him, if he could, to give the check to such irregular and unexampled methods. In short, he drew his pen and wrote three notable Epistles; one to the martyrs and confessors; another to his clergy; and a third to his people; insisting, in each of them, upon the novelty and unwarrantableness of the course (that?) was taken; the dishonours and indignities (that?) were done himself by it, and the great mischiefs and fatal consequences (that?) might, nay would, unavoidably follow upon it, if it were not forborn. More particularly,

In that to the martyrs and confessors, he told them—"That his episcopal care, and the fear of God, compelled him to admonish them, that as they had devoutly and courageously kept the faith, so they ought suitably to be observant of Christ's holy laws and discipline; that as it became all Christ's soldiers to obey their general's commands, so it was their duty, in a special manner, to be examples to others; that he had thought the Presbyters and Deacons who were with them, might have taught them so much, but that now, to his extreme grief, he understood they had been so far from doing that, that, on the contrary, some of them, especially some Presbyters, neither minding the fear of God nor the honour of their Bishop, had industriously misled them." He complained mightily of the presumption of such Presbyters, "that against all law and reason they should have dared to reconcile the lapsed without his consent; that herein they were more criminal than the lapsers themselves; that it was somewhat excusable in the lapsed to be earnest for an absolution, considering the uncomfortable state they were in, so long as they were denied the communion of the Church; but it was the duty of office-bearers in the Church to do nothing rashly, lest, instead of pastors, they should prove worriers of the flock," &c. And then he told these martyrs and confessors how far their privileges reached. All they could do was "by way of humble supplication to petition the Bishop for a relaxation of the rules of discipline; but they had neither power to command him, nor grant indulgences without him."[1] Indeed, this he told

[1] Solicitudo loci nostri, et timor Domini compellit, fortissimi et beatissimi martyres, admonere vos literis nostris, ut a quibus tam devote et fortiter servatur fides Domino, ab iisdem lex quoque et disciplina Domini reservetur. Nam cum omnes milites Christi custodire oporteat præcepta imperatoris sui, tum vos magis præceptis ejus obtemperare plus convenit qui exemplum cæteris facti estis et virtutis et timoris Dei. Et credideram quidem presbyteros et diaconos qui illic præsentes sunt, monere vos et instruere plenissime circa Evangelii legem, sicut in præteritum semper sub antecessoribus nostris factum est——. Sed nunc cum maximo animi dolore cognosco, non tantum illic vobis non suggeri divina præcepta, sed adhuc potius impediri, ut ea——a quibusdam presbyteris resolvantur, qui nec timorem Dei, nec Episcopi honorem cogitantes —— contra Evangelii legem——ante actam pœnitentiam, ante exomologesin gravissimi atque extremi delicti factam, ante manum ab Episcopo et clero in pœnitentiam impositam, offerre pro illis, et Eucharistiam dare, *i. e.* sanctum Domini corpus profanare audeant.——Et lapsis quidem potest in hoc venia con-

them frequently, and that they went beyond their line if they ventured any further.[1]

In that to his Presbyters and Deacons, he wrote in a yet more resenting strain. He told them he had long kept his patience and held his peace, but their immoderate presumption and temerity would suffer him no longer to be silent. "For what a dreadful prospect," says he, "must we have of the Divine vengeance, when some Presbyters, neither mindful of the gospel nor their own stations, nor regarding the future judgments of God, nor the Bishop, who for the time is set over them, dare attempt what was never attempted before under any of my predecessors, namely, so to affront and contemn their Bishop as to assume all to themselves?" And then he proceeds to tell them, "how he could overlook and bear with the indignity done to his Episcopal authority, if there were no more in it; but the course they followed was so wicked; they were so injurious to the lapsed whom they presumed to reconcile so uncanonically; their pride and popularity were so apparent in their method; it was such a crime so to expose the martyrs to envy and set them at variance with their Bishop, &c. that he could stifle it no longer." In short, all over the Epistle he wrote like a Bishop, and concluded it with a peremptory threatening of a "present suspension from the exercise of their office, and then an infliction of further censures when he should return from his retirement," if they should persevere in such a lawless course.[2]

cedi: quis enim non mortuus vivificari properet? quis non ad salutem suam venire festinet? Sed præpositorum est præceptum tenere, et vel properantes, vel ignorantes instruere, ne qui ovium pastores esse debent, lanii fiant. ——Petitiones et desideria vestra Episcopo servent, &c. Ep. 15, p. 33, 34.

[1] *Vide* de lapsis, p. 129, 131, 138. Ep. 16, p. 37. Ep. 17, p. 39. Ep. 36, p. 70.

[2] Diu patientiam meam tenui, fratres carissimi quasi verecundum silentium nostrum proficeret ad quietem. Sed cum quorundam immoderata et abrupta præsumptio temeritate sua, et honorem martyrum, et confessorum pudorem, et plebis universæ tranquillitatem turbare conetur; tacere ultra non oportet.——Quod enim non periculum metuere debemus de offensa domini; quando aliqui de Presbyteris, nec Evangelii, nec loci sui memores, sed neque futurum Domini judicium, neque nunc sibi præpositum Episcopum cogitantes, quod nunquam omnino sub antecessoribus factum est, cum contumelia et contemptu præpositi totum sibi vindicent?—Contumeliam Episcopatus nostri dissimulare et ferre possum, sicut dissimulavi semper et pertuli; sed dissimulandi nunc locus non est, quando

In that to his people, he proceeded on the same principles; condemned these Presbyters who had acted so disorderly, "not reserving to the Bishop the honour of his chair and priesthood;" told them "that these Presbyters ought to have taught the people otherwise;" laid to their charge the affectation of popularity; and required such of the people as had not fallen, to take pains upon the lapsed to try to bring them to a better temper, to persuade them to hearken to his counsel, and wait his return, &c.[1]

Here were three Epistles written, I think, in plain prelatick style; sure neither in the style of single Presbyter nor Presbyterian Moderator, especially if we consider the very next, written to his Presbyters and Deacons upon the same principles still. He had written to them several times before from the place of his retirement, but had received no answer from them. Now consider how he resents this, and, resenting it, asserts his own Episcopal authority—his own sovereign power in Ecclesiastick matters; for thus he begins—"I wonder, dear brethren, that you have returned no answers to the many letters I have sent you, especially considering that now, in my retirement, you ought to inform me of every thing that happens, that so I may, advisedly and deliberately, give orders concerning the affairs of the Church."[2]

decipiatur fraternitas nostra a quibusdam vestrum, qui dum sine ratione restituendæ salutis plausibiles esse cupiunt, magis lapsis obsunt—— Exponunt deinde invidiæ beatos martyres, et gloriosos servos Dei cum Dei Sacerdote committunt.——Interim temerarii et incauti et tumidi quidam inter vos, qui hominem non cogitent, vel Deum timeant; scientes quoniam si ultra in iisdem perseveraverint, utar ea admonitione, qua me uti Dominus jubet, ut interim prohibeantur offere, acturi et apud nos et apud confessores ipsos, et apud plebem universam causam suam, cum—Domino permittente, in sinum matris Ecclesiæ colligi cæperimus. Ep. 16, p. 36, 37, 38. Imo lege totam Epist.

[1] Audio tamen quosdam de Presbyteris nec Evangelii memores—— Nec Episcopo honorem sacerdotii sui et cathedræ reservantes, jam cum lapsis communicare cæpisse——Vos quidem nostri Presbyteri et Diaconi monere debuerant, ut commendatas sibi oves foverent.——Ego plebis nostræ et quietem novi pariter et timorem, qui in satisfactione Dei et deprecatione vigilarent, nisi illos quidam de Presbyteris gratificantes decepissent. Vel vos itaque singulos regite, et consilio ac moderatione vestra, et secundum divina præcepta lapsorum animos temperate, &c. Ep. 17, p. 39.

[2] Miror vos, fratres carissimi, ad multas epistolas meas, quas ad vos frequenter misi, nunquam mihi rescripsisse, cum fraternitatis nostræ vel

Let any man lay these four letters together, and weigh them impartially, and then let him judge if St Cyprian wrote in the style of parity, if he claimed not a sovereign power, a negative to himself, over *all* the christians, *Presbyters* as well as others, living within his district.

But did not Cyprian shew too much zeal in this cause? possibly he attempted to stretch his power a little too far, as afterwards many did. He was a holy and meek man, but such may be a little too high: So I read, indeed, in a late book.[1] But it seems the author has found himself very sore put to it when he said so; for how can one not be sore put to it when he cannot escape but by seeking for refuge in a reconciliation between pride and patience, superciliousness and self-denial, huffyness and humility, carnal height and christian holiness? But to let this pass,

Had that author any solid ground for saying so? or rather, had it been possible for him to have said so, had he had but an ordinary acquaintance with St Cyprian or his Epistles? Charge pride on the humble Cyprian! Cyprian, who was so very humble, that from the conscience of his own nothingness he has still been looked upon as a pattern of humility! Cyprian, whose humility would not allow him almost to speak in the stile of authority, even to female laicks![2] Cyprian, who was persuaded that God would hear none but the humble and quiet![3] Cyprian, who believed that none could be a Christian, and withal be proud and haughty![4] who insisted on his own humility in that very Epistle for which that author charges him with pride![5] who, if in any

utilitas vel necessitas sic utique gubérnetur, si a vóbis instructi rerum gerendarum consilium limare posimus. Ep. 18, p. 40.

[1] Rational Defence of Non-Conformity, p. 179.—[Gilbert Rule was the author of this work, which was intended as a reply to Stillingfleet's "Unreasonableness of Separation."—E.]

[2] Ad has loquimur, has adhortamur affectione potius quam potestate: non quod extremi et minimi et humilitatis nostræ admodum conscii, aliquid ad censuram licentiæ vindicemus, &c.—De Hab. Virg. p. 94.

[3] Si nos Dominus humiles et quietos——Conspexerit, tutos ab inimici infestationibus exhibebit. Ep. 11, p. 26.

[4] Et quisquam per ipsum (Christum) nunc, atque in ipso vivens extollere se audet et superbire, &c.——? Ep. 13, p. 30.

[5] *Vide* Superius Citata, ex Ep. 16.

[6] Nec nos putes, frater carissime, nostra et humana conscribere, aut ultronea voluntate hoc nobis audacter assumere, cum mediocritatem nostram semper humili et verecunda moderatione teneamus. Ep. 63, p. 148.

thing, gloried most in his humble and bashful modesty![6] who, when accused of pride, could appeal not only to all Christians, but even to the heathen infidels, as witnesses of his innocence![1] Cyprian, who had this great testimony from some of his contemporaries, "that he was the greatest preacher, the most eloquent orator, the wisest in counsel, the simplest in patience, the most charitable in alms, the holiest in abstinence, the humblest in obligingness, and the most innocent in every good action!"[2] And from others, "that he had a candid and a blessed breast!" &c.[3] In a word, Cyprian, whose humility was such, that if we may believe his Deacon Pontius, "he fled and lurk'd when they were going to make him a Bishop!"[4] Such that when St Augustine, many years after, was pressed with his authority, he came off with this, "the authority of Cyprian doth not fright me, because the humility of Cyprian encourages me!"[5] Such a person was Cyprian; and yet *so proud* was he, forsooth, for doing his duty, for asserting his Episcopal authority, when most undutifully trampled on by his presuming Presbyters.

What I have said, methinks, might be enough in all conscience for defeating for ever that uncharitable, shall I say, or ignorant suggestion, that it was pride, perhaps, that prompted Cyprian to write so magisterially to Carthaginian Presbyters; yet because a farther discussion of it may contribute not a little for clearing up the Bishop's negative in St Cyprian's time, I shall not grudge to give it you.

St Cyprian had three sorts of people to deal with in that controversy, which bred him so much trouble. He had the lapsed themselves; the martyrs and confessors; and these Presbyters and Deacons who had encroached so much on his Episcopal authority.

[1] Humilitatem meam et fratres omnes, et gentiles quoque optime norunt et diligunt. Ep. 66, p. 166.

[2] Es enim omnibus in tractatu major, in sermone facundior, in concilio sapientior, in patientia simplicior, in operibus largior, in abstinentia sanctior, in obsequio humilior, et in actu bono innocentior. Ep. 77, p. 234.

[3] ——Pectus illud tuum candidum ac beatum. Ep. 78, p. 235.——De animi tui candore——Ep. 79, p. 236.

[4] Pontius in Vita Cyp. p. 3.

[5] Non me terret auctoritas Cypriani, quia reficit humilitas Cypriani. August. De Baptismo contra Donat. lib. 2, cap. 1.—E.]

I am apt to think the author himself, with whom I have now to do, will not be shy to grant that St Cyprian, without incurring the reputation of either proud or presumptuous, might have chided the lapsed, as we find he did. They had cowardly renounced their christianity to save their lives and fortunes, and the Canons subjected them to a strict and a long penance for it; and I think, without the imputation of either height or humour, one in St Cyprian's station might have put them in mind of the respect they owed to the Canons of the Church, and the Governours of it. Indeed, all the lapsed were not engaged in the disorderly course: There were some of them who were sensible of their duty, and subjected themselves to their Bishop, resolving to wait his time, and entirely to depend upon him for their absolution, as we learn from his 33d Epistle.

His difficulty was greater with the martyrs and confessors, who appeared as patrons to the prejudicating lapsed; but neither need I insist on that, nor how he conquered them in point of right and argument; for this author told Dr Stillingfleet he was wholly out of the way in medling with that matter, seeing none ever imagined that every martyr had church power. Though I must tell you, Sir, that whoso reads St Cyprian's works, and particularly observes the state and management of this whole controversy about the lapsed, cannot but be convinced that the reputation and authority of *martyrs* and *confessors* made a far greater figure in it than the reputation or authority of *Presbyters*. To come, therefore, to that which is the main point with this author,

Let us try if St Cyprian stretched his power too far in his treatment of the Presbyters who appeared against him in this controversy. Consider the following steps, and then judge.

1. Consider that St Cyprian doth not fall a huffing or hectoring, or running them down by noise or clamour. No. He reasons the case with them, and reasons all along from known and received principles. He tells them plainly, indeed, "that in presuming, as they had done, they had forgotten both the gospel and their own station; that he was their *superior*; that they did not pay him the honour that was due to his chair and character; that the like had never been attempted before by Presbyters under any of his predecessor Bishops; that it was a factious, selfish temper,

and too great love of popularity that prompted them to measures so in nowise precedented; that he knew the secret of the matter, and that it was the old grudge against his being preferred to the Bishoprick that byassed them to their insolencies; that it belonged to him, as having the chief power of the keys, as being Bishop, *i. e.* as having the visible sovereignty in church matters, to straiten or slacken the sinews of discipline; to prolong or shorten the courses of penance; to grant absolutions and reconcile penitents, &c.: that such presumptions were encroachments upon the very foundations of the Church, to the subversion whereof their pretending to any power, in opposition to the Bishops tended. In short, that such practices were against Christ's institution, and the analogies of government, and all the laws of order, peace, and unity, and they deserved the sharpest censures for them." These, I say, are a sample of the arguments St Cyprian insisted on against those Presbyters; and most of them were founded on matter of fact; and now suppose St Cyprian had had considerable doses of pride, yet if you will but allow him withal to have had some grains of common sense or honesty, can you so much as imagine he could have used such arguments, if they had wanted foundation? would he not have been ashamed to have used them, if he, and not his Presbyters, had been guilty of the usurpations he was condemning? But what needs more? Have I not fully proved already that a Bishop, in St Cyprian's time, was the principle of unity to *all* the christians, *Presbyters* as well as others, within his district? and that he was a sovereign and peerless governour of the Church which he ruled. And were not all his reasonings founded on these principles? But this is not all; for,

2. Consider that they were not all the Presbyters of Carthage who were engaged in the quarrel. No, Rogatianus, Britius, Numidicus, and perhaps many more whose names are not transmitted to us, would never join with those of the faction, but still continued in their duty to St Cyprian.[1] And can we think they would not have joined with their brethren for the maintenance of their own rights

[1] [*Vide* Vindication, Chap. I. sec. 63, where the author recalls this consideration.—E.]

and privileges, if Cyprian had been the usurper? if he had been claiming a sovereign power, without any pretence of right to it? if he had been driving at a prelacy, when the government of the Church belonged to Presbyters acting in parity? We learn from St Cyprian himself, that in those times it was a "mighty wickedness for men to part tamely with their rights and powers in divine matters."[1] And can we think that Rogatianus, Britius, and Numidicus, were ignorant of this? Or, supposing that should have had small weight with them, is power such a gustless thing that men will easily part with it without any reason? But to go on.

3. Even those very Presbyters and Deacons of the faction came once to something like a dutiful submission in the matter. They lower'd their sails, and began to weave apologies, and knit excuses for what they had done: They endeavoured to put a fair face upon the foul steps they had made: They wrote to Cyprian that they had done what they could to bridle the heats of the lapsed, and oblige them to continue in their penances till his return from his retirement; but that they were so ungovernable and stiff, and urged a present absolution so eagerly and irresistibly, that they were forced in a manner to comply with their humours; but now seeing they found, that he, their Bishop, was so much displeased with what they had done, they asked a form from him, *i. e.* his will and pleasure in the matter.[2] And now let any man consider whether St Cyprian or these Presbyters had been in the wrong before? whether he or they had acted beyond their lines? But I have more to tell you; for,

4. These Presbyters, who had thus transgressed the bounds of their station, were generally condemned for it by their brethren Presbyters all the world over; at least, we have

[1] Quam periculosum sit autem in Divinis rebus ut quis cedat jure suo et potestate, &c. Ep. 73, p. 209.

[2] Legi literas vestras, fratres carissimi, quibus scripsistis salubre consilium vestrum non deesse fratribus nostris, ut temeraria festinatione deposita religiosam patientiam Deo præbeant; ut cum in unum per ejus misericordiam venerimus, de omnibus speciebus secundum ecclesiasticam disciplinam tractare possimus.——Quoniam tamen significastis quosdam immoderatos esse et communicationem accipiendam festinanter urgere; et desiderastis in hac re formam a me vobis dari, &c. Ep. 19, p. 41.

a most remarkable instance in the presbyters of Rome. Take it thus :—

St Cyprian being a wise and watchful, as well as an holy and humble[1] prelate—one who had still before his eyes the conservation of the order, the peace and the unity of the Church Catholick ; and perceiving that the controversy concerning the restitution of the lapsed might be of bad influence on those great interests, if not prudently determined, thought fit to acquaint his brethren of the Episcopal College with it, and ask their sentiments about it. And because there was no Bishop then at Rome, he wrote to the Presbyters and Deacons, the Roman Presbytery. The Epistle is the twentieth in number, in which he deduced the whole matter to them, and told them particularly how he had exerted his Episcopal authority in its vigour, against such of his presbyters as, without his leave, had boldly and presumptuously absolved the lapsed, and given them the Sacrament.[2] Now consider their return to him: you have it in the 30th Epistle.

They begin with the acknowledgement of his supreme and unaccountable power within his own district, which I observed before :[3] They impute it to his modesty and caution, (not to his pride and petulancy), that he had been pleased to communicate his measures to them : They approve the course he had taken with the lapsed. They compare him to the master of a ship sitting at the helm, who, if he steers not right, and keeps not a steady course, especially in a storm, endangers the ship, and runs her upon rocks and shelves ; and I think the *master* of a ship doth not act in *parity* with the rest of the mariners. And further, they compare those who at that time endeavoured to interrupt the course of his discipline, presbyters as well as others, to the tumbling waves, striving to shake the master from the helm, and expose all to the hazards of shipwreck. In plain terms, they condemn the course of reconciling the lapsed so undutifully and rebelliously. As for themselves, they tell him, (and pray take notice of it), that, wanting a Bishop,

[1] [*Vide* " Appendix to Poole's St Cyprian's Testimony against Rome," p. 217, where the humility of St Cyprian is vindicated.—E.]

[2] Item Presbyteris et Diaconibus non defuit sacerdotii vigor, ut quidam disciplinæ minus memores, et temeraria festinatione præcipites, qui cum lapsis communicare jam cæperant, comprimerentur. Ep. 20, p. 43.

[3] *Supra*, p. 42, Note 3.

they could define nothing in the matter: they tell him, I say, that since the death of Fabianus of most noble memory, through the difficulties of the times, and the encumbrances of their affairs, they had not got a Bishop constituted, who only could define in these matters, and determine in the case of the lapsed with authority and counsel.[1] But withal they tell him, that, for their parts, they were extremely well pleased with the course he had taken, namely, that he had resolved to do nothing rashly, to take no sudden resolutions in a matter of such consequence, but to wait till God should grant him opportunity of treating about it with others, and determining with common advice in such a ticklish case,[2] where, observe by the way, that they do not sound the wisdom of this his resolution on anything like the incompetency of his power, for having determined by himself concerning the lapsed within his own district: no, the reason they give for it supposes his power to have been fully adequate and competent for that effect, and that if he had given the final stroke, nobody could have quarrelled it; for they insist only on the rules of *prudence*, which, if I mistake not, are quite different from the rules of *power*. They tell him it might prove "invidious and burdensome for one Bishop to determine by himself in a case in which all Bishops were concerned, and that it was providently done of him to desire the consent of his colleagues, that his decrees might be approved and confirmed, that they might not be made void through the want of the brotherly ratifications." These are the reasons, I say, for which they justify his caution; and these reasons suppose he had power to have done otherwise, though not so wisely nor so warily. And then they tell him over again, "that they had met frequently, and canvassed

[1] Quenquam nobis differendæ hujus rei necessitas major incumbat, quibus, post excessum nobilissimæ memoriæ viri Fabiani, nondum est Episcopus propter rerum et temporum difficultates constitutus, qui omnia ista moderetur, et eorum, qui lapsi sunt possit cum *auctoritate* et consilio habere rationem. Ep. 30, p. 58.

[2] Quanquam nobis in tam ingenti negotio placeat, quod et tu ipse tractasti; prius Ecclesiæ pacem sustinendam, deinde, sic collatione consiliorum cum Episcopis, Presbyteris, Diaconis, confessoribus, pariter ac stantibus laicis facta, lapsorum tractare rationem. Perquam enim nobis et invidiosum onerosum videtur, non per multo examinare, quod per multos commissum videatur fuisse, et unum sententiam dicere, cum tam grande crimen per multos diffusum notetur exisse; quoniam nec firmum decretum potest esse, quod non plurimorum videbitur habuisse consensum. Ibid.

the matter seriously; they had tossed it, not only amongst themselves, but with several Bishops, far and near, as they had occasion, to be in the city; and that still the conclusion was, that they should attempt no innovations till a Bishop should be settled: All they had resolved was, that those of the lapsed whose health might allow, should continue in the state of the penitents till God should grant them a Bishop."[1]

Neither was this a mere compliment to our Holy Martyr: indeed, in all this they gave him a true account of their real sentiments and principles, as we learn from another epistle of theirs, wherein they had neither occasion nor temptation to compliment Bishops. The epistle is that which is the eighth amongst St Cyprian's. An epistle written by them to the Presbyters and Deacons of Carthage—to persons of their own rank and quality: by consequence, an epistle in which, had they understood it, had the principles of those times allowed it, they might have spoken their minds very freely concerning the power of presbyters. Never had presbyters, I am sure, more freedom, or better opportunity, to have asserted their own power and vindicated parity, and condemned prelatical usurpation in an epistle, than they had on that occasion; for Fabianus, Bishop of Rome, was dead, and Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, was retired; and so it was written by presbyters who had no Bishop, to presbyters in the absence of their Bishop. And yet, in that epistle, they were so far from having any such notions, that they said expressly that both themselves who wanted one, and those of Carthage who wanted the presence of one, were only "seemingly the governors of those respective Churches, and only kept the flocks, instead of the respective pastors, the Bishops."[2] And further, telling what pains they had been at to keep people

[1] Cujus temperamenti moderamen nos hic tenere quærentes, diu et quidem multi, et quidem cum quibusdam Episcopis vicinis nobis et appropinquantibus et quos ex aliis provinciis longe positis persecutionis istius ardor ejecerat, ante constitutionem Episcopi nihil innovandum putavimus, sed lapsorum curam mediocriter temperandam esse credidimus; ut interim dum Episcopus dari a Deo nobis sustinetur, in suspenso eorum qui moras possunt dilationis sustinere, causa teneatur. Ibid. p. 60.

[2] Et cum incumbat nobis qui *videmur* præpositi esse, et *vice pastoris* custodire gregem. Ep. 8, p. 16.

from apostatizing in the day of trial, they account how they treated those who had fallen, particularly that they did separate them from the flock indeed, but so as not to be wanting in their duty and assistance to them: they did what was proper for their station: they exhorted them to continue patiently in their penances, as being the most plausible method for "obtaining indulgences from him who could give them"[1]—that is, without controversy, from the Bishop when he should be settled. For so I read in an epistle written at that same time by Celerinus a Roman to Lucianus a Carthaginian, and the twenty-first in number among St Cyprian's, that when the cause of Numeria and Candida, two female lapsers, was brought before the presbytery of Rome, the presbytery commanded them to continue as they were, *i. e.* in the state of penitents, "till a Bishop should be enthroned."[2] And now, let any man judge whether, according to the principles and sentiments of the presbyters of Rome, St Cyprian or his presuming presbyters had taken too much upon them at Carthage. But neither is this all yet; for,

5. These Carthaginian presbyters were also condemned by the Roman martyrs and confessors, who, though they were in prison, had learned the state of the controversy from the accounts St Cyprian had sent to Rome, two of them, Moyses and Maximus being also presbyters. These martyrs and confessors wrote also to St Cyprian, and to the same purpose the Roman clergy had done. Their epistle is the 31st in number, in which they not only beg with a peculiar earnestness that he being so glorious a Bishop, would pray for them; they not only lay a singular stress upon his prayers beyond the prayers of others, by reason of the opinion they had of his holy virtues, which, I am apt to think, such men as they would not probably have done had they believed him to have been a proud aspiring prelate, that is, indeed, a limb of antichrist, as this author would fain give him out to have been; but also they heartily congratulate his discharging so laudably his Episcopal office, and

[1] Sed ipsos cohortati sumus et hortamur agere pœnitentiam si quomodo indulgentiam poterunt recipere ab *eo qui potest præstare*. Ep. 8, p. 17.

[2] Quarum jam causa audita, præceperunt eas præpositi tantisper si esse, donec Episcopus constituatur. Ep. 21, p. 46.

that even in his retirement he had made it so much his care to acquit himself, "that he had halted in no part of his duty;" and particularly, "that he had suitably censured and rebuked, not only the lapsed, who, little regarding the greatness of their guilt, had, in his absence, extorted the Church's peace from his presbyters, but even these presbyters, for their profane facility in giving that which was holy to dogs, and casting pearls before swine, without any regard to the gospel." In short, they approve his whole proceeding, as having done nothing unsuitable to his character, nothing unbecoming either an holy or an humble Bishop.[1] Further yet,

6. These same Carthaginian presbyters, resuming their former boldness, and topping it over again with their Bishop, were excommunicated by him, and his sentence was approved and ratified by all Catholick Bishops in all Catholick Churches all the world over, as shall be shewn you fully by and by. And then,

7. And lastly, That in all this matter St Cyprian did nothing either proudly or presumptuously, is evident from this, that in his time, and long before his time, even from the Apostles' times, it was not lawful for presbyters to attempt any thing relating to the Church without the Bishop. "Let Presbyters and Deacons attempt nothing without the Bishop's allowance; for it is he to whom the Lord's people are committed, and it is he that must account for their souls,"[2] is the 39th of the Canons called Apostolical. And no doubt it was in force in St Cyprian's time. And this was no greater power than was assigned him by the Apostolical Ignatius, I cannot tell how many times. Take these testimonies for a sample.—"Let no man do any thing that

[1] Pete ergo, Cypriane carissime, ut nos gratia sua Dominus—armet et illustret——Cui enim magis hæc, ut pro nobis petat, mandare debemus, quam tam Glorioso Episcopo?——Ecce aliud gaudium nostrum, quod in officio Episcopatus tui, licet interim a fratribus pro temporis conditione distractus es, tamen non defuisti——Animadvertimus enim te congruente censura, et eos digne objurgasse, qui immemores delictorum suorum, pacem a presbyteris per absentiam tuam festinata et præcipiti cupiditate extorsissent; et *illos* qui sine respectu Evangelii sanctum Domini canibus, et margaritas porcis profana facilitate donassent. Ep. 31.

[2] Οἱ Πρεσβύτεροι καὶ διάκονοι ἄνευ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν ἐπιτελλέτωσαν. Αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ πεπιστευμένος τον λαὸν τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ τον ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν λογον ἀπαιτηθησόμενος. Can. Ap. 39.

belongs to the Church without the Bishop."[1] "He that honoureth the Bishop, is honoured of God; but he that doth any thing in opposition to the Bishop, serveth the devil."[2] "If any man pretend to be wiser than the Bishop, (*i. e.* will have things done against the Bishop's will), he is corrupted."[3] "Let us be careful not to resist the Bishop, as we would be subject to God."[4] "The spirit hath spoken, do ye nothing without the Bishop."[5] "It is necessary that you continue to do nothing without the Bishop."[6]

And now, let any of common sense determine whether there was ground, or shadow of ground, for insinuating that St Cyprian shewed too much zeal in this cause, or attempted to stretch his power a little too far, (indeed, it had not been a little, but very much, nay monstrously too far, had those of parity been then the current principles), or was a little too high in this matter? But if there was no ground to say so, if it was contrary to all the then current principles, and to the common sentiments of all Catholick Christians, nay, even to the convictions of all honest, orderly, dutiful, and conscientious presbyters, who then lived, to say so;—if thus it was, I say, and it is hard to prove any matter of fact more evidently than I have proved that it was thus, then I think it follows by good consequence, not only that this author was a little in the wrong to St Cyprian when he said so, but also that in St Cyprian's time a Bishop had fairly a negative over his presbyters, which was the thing to be demonstrated. And so I proceed to the next thing proposed, namely,

III. That all the other church governors within his district, presbyters as well as others, were, in St Cyprian's

[1] Μηδεὶς χωρὶς τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου τὶ πρασσέτω των ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. Ignat. Epist. p. 6.—[Ed. Oxon. p. 4.—E.]

[2] Ὁ τιμων ἐπίσκοπον ὑπὸ θεοῦ τετίμηται: Ὁ λάθρα ἐπισκόπου τὶ πράσσων τῳ διαβόλῳ λατρεύει. P. 7.—[Ed. Oxon. p. 5.—E.]

[3] Καὶ ἐὰν γνωσθῇ πλέον τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ἔφθαρται. P. 13.—[Ed. Oxon. p. 9. Ep. ad Polycarp.—E.]

[4] Σκυδάσωμεν οὖν μὴ ἀντιτασσεσθαι τῳ ἐπισκόπῳ ἵνα ὦμεν θεοῦ ὑποτασσόμενοι. P. 20.—[Ed. Oxon. Ep. ad Ephes. p. 14.—E.]

[5] Τό δὲ πνεῦμα ἐκήρυσσεν λέγων τάδε: Χωρὶς Ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν ποιεῖτε. P. 43. —[Ed. Oxon. ad Philadelp. p. 28.—E.]

[6] Ἀνάγκαῖον οὖν ἐστιν, ὥσπερ ποιεῖτε ἄνευ τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν πράσσειν ὑμᾶς. P. 47.—[Ed. Oxon. Ep. ad Trall. p. 31.—E.]

time, subject to the Bishop's authority, and obnoxious to his discipline. I do not think you very sharp sighted if you have not seen this already. Yet, that I may give you all reasonable satisfaction, I shall insist a little further on it. And,

1. This might appear sufficiently from this one consideration, (though no more could be produced for it), that, still in the stile and language of those times, the Bishop was called the Præpositus, the Ruler, the Governor, the Superior, of all the Christians within his district, clergy as well as laity; and they, without distinction or exception, were called his people, his flock, his subjects, &c. This may be seen almost in every one of his epistles. Thus, Ep. 3, he says, "that Deacons ought to remember that our Lord chose his Apostles, that is, Bishops and Governors. But the Apostles chose Deacons to be the Bishop's and the Church's ministers; and therefore a Deacon ought with all humility to give satisfaction to the Bishop, his superior;"[1] and, Ep. 9, "he praises the Roman Clergy for having the memory of Fabianus, who had been their superior, in so great honour."[2] And, Ep. 13, writing to Rogatianus his presbyter, and the rest of the confessors, and praising God for their faith and patience, he says, "that as all Christians were bound to rejoice when Christ's flock was illuminated by the examples of confessors; so he himself, in a special manner, as being the Bishop, seeing the Church's glory was the ruler's glory."[3] And in that famous passage which I have cited already from Ep. 16, he complains of it as an unexampled petulancy, that presbyters should so contemn the Bishop, their superior.[4] And in

[1] Meminisse autem diaconi debent, quoniam Apostolos, *i. e.* Episcopos et præpositos Dominus elegit: diaconos autem post ascensum Domini in cælos Apostoli sibi constituerunt Episcopatus sui et Ecclesiæ ministros—et ideo oportet diaconum, de quo scribis, agere audaciæ suæ pœnitentiam et honorem sacerdotis agnoscere, et Episcopo *Præposito* suo plena humilitate satisfacere. Ep. 3, p. 6.

[2] In quo vobis quoque plurimum gratulor, quod ejus memoriam tam celebri et illustri testimonio prosequamini: ut per vos innotesceret nobis, quod et vobis esset circa *Præpositi* memoriam gloriosum, et nobis quoque fidei ac virtutis præberet exemplum. Ep. 9, p. 19.

[3] Nam cum gaudere in hoc omnes fratres oportet, tum in gaudio communi major est Episcopi portio. Ecclesiæ enim gloria, *Præpositi* Gloria est. Ep. 13, p. 28.

[4] *Supra*, p. 74.

another place, " we Bishops, who have the chief power in the Church."[1] And Ep. 62, " I who, by the divine mercy, govern the Church, have sent to you, [Januarius, Maximus, Proculus,] &c., 100,000 Sesterces, as the charitable contribution of my clergy and people."[2] And Ep. 66, " Hence spring heresies and schisms, &c. That the Bishop who is one, and is set over the Church, is contemned." &c.[3] Such was the dialect of those times, I say, and thus Bishops were called rulers, governors, superiours, &c., and that in regard of all within their districts, making no discrimination betwixt clergymen and laicks; and not only so, but more particularly,

2. It was as common, in that dialect, to call the clergy the *Bishop's Clergy*. Thus for example, Ep. 14, " It was my wish that I might have saluted all my clergy safe and sound," &c.[4] " My Presbyters and Deacons ought to have taught you," &c.[5] " Because I cannot send letters but by clergymen, and I know that many of mine are absent."[6] " Numidicus was preserved alive by God, that he might join him to my clergy"[7]—" Urbanus and Sidonius came to my presbyters"[8]—" If any of my Presbyters or Deacons shall turn precipitant"[9]—" I have sent you copies of the letters which I wrote to my clergy and people concerning Felicis-

[1] Quam unitatem firmiter tenere et vindicare debemus, maxime Episcopi, qui in Ecclesia *præsidemus*. De Unit. Eccl. p. 108.

[2] Misimus autem sestertium centum millia nummum, quæ istic in Ecclesia, cui de Domini indulgentia *præsumus*, cleri et plebis apud nos consistentis collatione collecta sunt. Ep. 62, p. 147.

[3] Inde enim schismata et hæreses obortæ sunt et oriuntur, dum Episcopus qui unus est, et Ecclesiæ *præest*, superba quorundam præsumtione contemnitur—— Ep. 66, p. 167.

[4] Optaveram quidem, fratres carissimi, ut universum clerum *nostrum* integrum et incolumem meis literis salutarem. Ep. 14, p. 31.

[5] Vos quidem nostri Presbyteri et Diaconi monere debuerant —— Ep. 17, p. 39.

[6] Et quoniam oportuit me per clericos scribere : scio autem *nostros* plurimos absentes esse—— Ep. 29, p. 55.

[7] ——Ut eum clero *Nostro* Dominus adjungeret, et desolatam per lapsum quorundam *Presbyterii Nostri* copiam, gloriosis Sacerdotibus adornaret. Ep. 40, p. 79.

[8] Urbanus et Sidonius confessores ad presbyteros *Nostros* venerunt. Ep. 49, p. 92.

[9] Interea si quis immoderatus et præceps, sive de *Nostris* presbyteris vel diaconis——Ep. 34, p. 68.

simus and his presbytery"[1]—And, as I observed before, when Maximus a presbyter, and Urbanus, &c., returned from the Novatian Schism to Cornelius's Communion, "we are reconciled" (say they to Cyprian) "to Cornelius *our Bishop*, and to all the clergy."[2]

Such was the language of those times. Now, I say by what propriety of speech could a Bishop have been called Præpositus, Superior to his Clergy? Could they have been called *his* Clergy? Could he have been said to have been their Bishop? their Ruler? their Governor? By what rule of either grammar or rhetoric, logic or politic, could he have been said to have been set over them, or they to have been his subjects or inferiors, if he had no power nor jurisdiction over them? if they were not subjected to his authority, nor obnoxious to his discipline? But let all this pass for mere prolusion if you will. I am not pinched for want of arguments. For,

3. The three great principles which I proved so fully before, viz.:—That a Bishop in St Cyprian's time was the principle of unity to the Church which he governed; that he had a supreme power in it; and that by the principles which then prevailed, he was the same in the Christian Church, which the High Priest was in the Jewish; and the last thing I proved also, viz.:—that he had a negative over his presbyters; each of these is demonstration for the present conclusion, and you need not artificial, natural logic is enough to let you see the consequences. Indeed,

4. We find Cyprian all along both reasoning and practising to this purpose. Thus he told Bishop Rogatianus, Ep. 3. "That the case was plain between him and his Deacon: he might punish him forthwith, by his Episcopal power: and his Cathedral authority:"[3] "he might make him sensible of his Episcopal honour:"[4] "he might exert the

[1] ——Exempla literarum—qua ad te miseram, quæ de eodem Felicissimo et de presbyterio ejusdem ad clerum istic *Nostrum*——scripseram. Ep. 45, p. 88.

[2] ——Cum Cornelio Episcopo *Nostro* pariter et cum universo clero pacem fecisse———Ep. 53, p. 98.

[3] Et tu quidem honorifice circa nos, et pro solita tua humilitate fecisti, ut malles de eo conqueri, cum pro Episcopatus vigore et cathedræ auctoritate haberes potestatem, qua posses de illo statim vindicari. Ep. 3, p. 5.

[4] ——Oportet Diaconum, agere audaciæ suæ pœnitentiam, et honorem sacerdotis agnoscere. Ep. 3, p. 6.

power of his honour against him, either by deposing, or by excommunicating him ;"[1] nay, " he might excommunicate all such as should rebel against him :"[2] " for all these censures, his sovereign authority was competent.[3]

Thus he praises Pomponius, another Bishop, for excommunicating another scandalous deacon,[4] Ep. 4. And did not he himself suspend Philumenus and Fortunatus, two subdeacons, and Favorinus an acolyth, from their livings? as we learn from his 34th Epistle.[5]

But you may say, these instances extend no further than to deacons, or more inferior clergymen ; but what is this to presbyters? Why? Sir, indeed, the instances are pat and home ; and you must acknowledge so much, if you consider that, by the principles of those times, there was no disparity between presbyters and inferiour orders in this respect : but the Bishop's power extended equally to all ; just as a king can censure his chancellor as well as a sub-collector of his customs—a justice-general[6] as well as a justice of peace. Nothing clearer from the above mentioned principles. But that I may leave you no imaginable scruple, I shall even account to you about presbyters also.

5. Then, I have told you already how some of the Carthaginian presbyters conspired against St Cyprian, and used their utmost arts to hinder his preferment to the Bishopric. Now, if we may believe either himself, or Pontius in his life, whatever it was they did on that occasion, he might have punished them for it—punished them not only with deposition, but with excommunication, had he pleased. Take first his own account in Ep. 43, there he tells his people— " That through the malignity and perfidiousness of some of his presbyters, he durst not adventure to return to Carthage so soon as he would." And he describes those presbyters thus :—" That being mindful of their conspiracy, and retain-

[1] Quod si ultra te contumeliis suis exacerbaverit et provocaverit, fungeris circa eum potestate honoris tui, ut eum vel deponas vel abstineas.

[2] Et si qui alii tales extiterint, et contra sacerdotem Dei fecerint, vel *coercere* poteris, vel *abstinere*.

[3] —— *Sacerdotali licentia*—— Ep. 3, p. 6, 7.

[4] [Et idcirco et cum rigore fecisti, frater carissimi, abstinendo Diaconum, qui. Ep. 4, p. 9.—E.]

[5] [Interim se a divisione mensurna contingant. Ep. 34, p. 68.—E.]

[6] [The official title of the highest legal authority in the Scottish Courts. —E.]

ing their old grudges against his promotion, they reinforced their ancient machinations, and renewed their attempts for undermining him, by siding with Felicissimus in his schism." And then he proceeds thus—" I neither willed nor wished their punishment for their opposition to my promotion; yea, I pardoned them, and kept my peace; and yet, now they have suffered condign punishment. Though I did not excommunicate them then, their own guilty consciences have done it now; they have excommunicated themselves," &c.[1] Take it next from Pontius his deacon, " Though I am unwilling," says he, " yet I must speak it out." Some resisted his promotion, but how gently, how patiently, how generously, how mercifully, did he forgive them? Did he not thereafter admit them to his most intimate friendship and familiarity, to the astonishment of many? Indeed, he therein shewed a miracle of clemency.[2] Lay these two accounts together, and then tell me if these presbyters were not obnoxious to his discipline?—if his power over them might not have extended to their very excommunication, for their old tricks against him, had he been willing to have put it in execution? But this is not all; for have I not accounted already, how, when they first engaged in the controversy concerning the lapsed, he threatened them that if they should continue to absolve and reconcile any more of them without his allowance, he would suspend them from their office, and inflict severer censures on them when he should return to Carthage? and have I not justified him in this, and made it manifest to a demonstration, that herein he did not stretch his power too far? that he took not too much on him? Farther yet.

[1] Hoc enim quorundam presbyterorum malignitas et perfidia perfecit, ne ad vos ante diem paschæ venire licuisset: dum conjurationis suæ memores, et antiqua illa contra Episcopatum meum——venena retinentes, instaurant veterem contra nos impugnationem suam, et sacrilegas machinationes insidiis solitis denuo revocant. Et quidem de Dei providentia nobis hoc nec volentibus, nec optantibus, imo et ignoscentibus, et tacentibus, pœnas quas meruerant rependerunt, ut a nobis non ejecti ultro se ejicerent, ipsi in se pro conscientia sua sententiam darent; —— conjurati et scelerati de ecclesia sponte se pellerent. Ep. 43, p. 81, 82.

[2] Invitus dico, sed dicam necesse est; quidam illi restiterunt, etiam ut vinceret. Quibus tamen quanta lenitate, quam patienter, quam benevolenter indulsit, quam clementer ignovit, amicissimos eos postmodum et inter necessarios computans, mirantibus multis? Cui enim possit non esse miraculo, tam memoriosæ mentis oblivio? Pont. in Vita Cyp. p. 3, 4.

When they resumed their impudence, and after a little interruption would needs be absolving the lapsed, though he was then in his retirement, and by consequence had few or none of his clergy to consult with, yet he gave out this plain and peremptory order—That "if any of his presbyters or deacons should prove so lawless or precipitant as to communicate with the lapsed before his determination in the matter, and, by consequence, without his leave, that they should be forthwith suspended from the communion, and should be more fully tried and censured when he should return."[1] And then,

Lastly, When they proceeded so far as to commence the schism with Felicissimus; mark it well, he not only gave a delegation to Caldonius and Herculanus, two Bishops, and Rogatianus and Numidicus, two of his own presbyters, to judge and excommunicate Felicissimus and his partizans, as I have showed already, but he likewise excommunicated the five presbyters who joined with him, and all who should adhere to them.[2] And he gave an account of his proceedings to all Catholic Bishops, particularly to Cornelius Bishop of Rome;[3] and his sentence was not only ratified by Cornelius, and Felicissimus and all his party refused *his* communion, but they met with the same treatment [from others].[4] St Cyprian's sentence was approved and confirmed by all Catholick churches all the world over.[5]

I might easily have proved this more fully, but I think I have said enough. And now, Sir, lay these three things

[1] Interea si quis immoderatus, et præceps, sive de nostris Presbyteris vel Diaconibus, sive de peregrinis ausus fuerit ante *sententiam nostram* communicare cum lapsis, a communicatione nostra arceatur; apud omnes nos causam dicturus temeritatis suæ, quando in unum, permittente Domino, convenerimus. Ep. 34, p. 68.

[2] Si quis autem pœnitentiam agere, et Deo satisfacere detrectans, ad Felicissimi et satellitum ejus partes concesserit, et se hæreticæ factioni conjunxerit; sciat se postea ad ecclesiam redire et cum Episcopis et plebe Christi communicare non posse. Ep. 42, p. 85.

[3] *Vide* Ep. 45, p. 88.

[4] [The sense seems to require this insertion.—E.]

[5] Legi literas tuas, fratres carissimi,—quibus significasti, Felicissimum hostem Christi——abstentum et non tantum mea, sed plurimorum co-episcoporum sententia condemnatum, a te illic esse rejectum, &c. Ep. 59, p. 126. —[Although there can be no question that, according to Catholic usage, this was the case, still I do not think the words here quoted —"Plurimorum Episcoporum sententia," are sufficient to establish the fact.—E.]

together, viz. that there were several considerable acts of Church power peculiar to a Bishop in St Cyprian's time, and which those in the order of single presbyters could not meddle with—that a Bishop, as such, had a negative over all the presbyters within his district, and that they were all subordinate to him, and obnoxious to his discipline. And then I can refer it to yourself to determine, whether a *Bishop*, then, was not quite another thing than either *single presbyter*, or *presbyterian moderator*.

Thus, I think, I have sufficiently defeated our author's definition of a Bishop in St Cyprian's time, by giving a fair and just account of him, as he stood related to his own *particular Church* which he governed. I come now to consider him as he stood related to the *Church Catholic*. And here also I am very much mistaken if I shall not find matter enough for another demonstration against him. I shall endeavour to dispatch this point with all possible brevity.

1. Then, by the principles of the Cyprianic age, all Bishops were colleagues, and made up one College. St Cyprian calls them so, and speaks of the Episcopal or Sacerdotal College so frequently—no fewer than six or seven times in one Epistle, and four or five times in another[1]—that I need not adduce testimonies. Indeed, being all men of the same character, the same order, the same dignity—being all of them equally supreme, and first in their own Churches, and all standing collateral to one another—they were most properly called colleagues, and their society a College, if we may rely on A(ulus) Gellius his skill in the Latin tongue, or rather Messala's cited by him.[2] And it is observable to this purpose, that St Cyprian no where calls *presbyters* his *colleagues;* he calls none so but *Bishops*. And the notion of the Episcopal College had such an impression on him—it was so common and received in those times, that speaking even of schismatical Bishops, who run one course, he calls

[1] Ep. 55, et 68.

[2] [Auli Gellii Noctes Att. Ed. Gronov. Lugd. Bat. 1706. Lib. 13, c. 15, the heading of which is, "Verba ex libro Messalæ auguris, quibus docet qui sunt minores magistratus, et consulem, prætoremque *collegas* esse," &c. The passage referred to is that which begins thus—"Patriciorum auspicia in duas sunt divisa potestates. Maxima sunt consulum, prætorum, censorum, neque tamen, eorum omnium inter se eadem, aut ejusdem potestatis: ideo quod collegæ non sunt censores consulum aut prætorum; prætores consulum sunt."—E.]

them a College also, though quite different from the true College of Catholick and orthodox Bishops.[1] Now,

2. As the one Bishop was the principle of unity to a particular Church, so this College of Bishops was the principle of unity to the Catholick Church; and Jesus Christ was the principle of unity to the College of Bishops. I hope, not being a Romanist, you will not require that I should prove the highest step of this gradation.[2] All that remains, then, is to explain how the College of Bishops, by the principles of those times, was the principle of unity to the Church Catholick, or the one great aggregated body, consisting of all the particular Churches all the world over, whereof their particular Bishops were the particular principles of unity. Neither needs this be a laborious task. For all that is necessary for it is to show how they were so united into one College, as to make them capable of being justly denominated one principle of unity. Now, they were thus united by the great and fundamental laws of one faith and one communion.

That the one Holy Catholick Faith is essential in the

[1] Privatus Lambesitanus——fortunatum sibi pseudo-Episcopum dignum *Collegio Suo* fecit. Ep. 59, p. 132.

[2] The question at issue between us and those whom our author includes under the term "Romanists," is, whether *Jure Div.* there is a visible head of the College of Bishops, and who is he? It is a momentous question, involving our existence as a part of the Catholic Church. But with the light of scripture and tradition, we are sufficiently borne out in resisting the claims of the Bishop of Rome, and in repelling the charge of schism from our Church. The argument used to be considered a purely historical one, but (whether he found the evidence of the Papal claims to universal and Divine supremacy, unsubstantiated by history, and therefore untenable, we cannot say), the learned and excellent Mr Newman has adopted a new theory of developement, by which he endeavours to demonstrate that the supremacy (the scheme applies to other doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church) is a natural fruit, which the original constitution of the Church had a tendency to produce. As the historical argument has been treated by several of our divines—by Archbishop Bramhall, Falkner, Barrow, Bishop Hopkins of America, and most ably, [at least so far as regards the exemption of the British Isles from the Western Patriarchate), by Dr Inett, See Introduction to Wordsworth Eccles. Biog.: and the Rev. T. Allies: So the theory of developement has already met with the deepest consideration, and is opposed by many eminent cotemporary Theologians—by Professor Maurice, in the Preface to his Warburtonian Lectures, Lond. 1846—by Dr Butler of Trinity College, Dublin, in the early Nos. of the Irish Ecclesiastical Journal, 1846,——by the Rev. F. Garden in the "Theologian," 1846, Nos. 1, 2, &c.—By the Rev. W. Gresley,——by the Rev. W. Palmer of Worcester College, Oxford, to whose treatises any persons made anxious by Mr Newman's elaborate work may refer with advantage.—E.]

constitution of the one Holy Catholick Church, is, even to this day, a received principle, I think, amongst all sober Christians. But then, I say that the Christians in St Cyprian's time reckoned of the *laws of one Communion* as every whit as forcible and indispensible to the being of one Church as *the laws of one faith*. It was a prime, a fundamental article of their faith, that there was but one Church, and they could not understand how there could be but one Church, if there was more than one Communion. By their principles and reasonings, a multiplication of Communions made, unavoidably, a multiplication of Churches; and, by consequence, seeing that there could be but one true Catholick Church, there could be likewise but one true Catholick Communion. All other Churches or Communions were false, *i. e.* not at all Christian Churches or Communions. These principles, and suitable reasonings from them, are so frequently and so fully insisted on in St Cyprian's writings, that to transcribe his testimonies to this purpose were almost to transcribe his works. Now, from these principles it follows clearly,

3. That the grand concern of the Episcopal College was, to preserve and maintain this one Communion; to guard against all such doctrines as destroyed, or tended to destroy, the one holy Catholick faith, and all schisms and schismatical methods which destroyed, or tended to destroy, the unity of the one Church. These being the great and fundamental interests of the one Church, and they being her supreme governours, they could not but be chiefly bound by the most fundamental laws of their office to be conscientious conservators of these great and fundamental interests. And indeed, so they believed themselves to be, as will evidently appear from the following considerations. And,

1. They looked upon themselves as bound indispensibly to maintain the peace, the unity, the concord, the unanimity, the honour—they are all St Cyprian's words—of the College itself. Every error, every defect, every thing disjointed, or out of tune in it, tended naturally to endanger the great interests, for the conversation and procuration of which it was instituted. For this end,

2. Because every man, by being promoted to the Episcopal dignity, was, *eo ipso*, a principle of unity to a particular

Church, and so a member of the Episcopal College, all possible care was taken that a fit person should be promoted, and that the promotion should be unquestionable. Therefore he was not to be promoted, as I have proved, but where there was an unquestionable vacancy: Therefore he was not to be promoted if there was any thing uncanonical or challengeable in his baptism, or his confirmation, or his promotion to any former order, as I have shewn also in the case of Novatianus:[1] Therefore he was solemnly "elected in the presence of the people, that either his crimes might be detected, or his merits published; because the people was best acquainted with every man's life and conversation:"[2] Therefore he was to be solemnly ordained in the presence of the people also;[3] and that by two or three Bishops at fewest, (though an ordination performed by one Bishop was truly valid), commonly there were more, all the Bishops of the province.

3. Being thus canonically promoted, his first work was to send his communicatory letters to all other Bishops, to give them thereby an account of his canonical promotion, his orthodoxy in the faith, his fraternal disposition, &c. Thus, Cornelius was no sooner ordained Bishop of Rome than he instantly dispatched his communicatory letters to St Cyprian,[4] and no doubt, as the custom was, to all other Bishops, at least to all Metropolitans, by them to be communicated to the Bishops within their provinces; I say, to Metropolitans, for nothing can be clearer than that there were Metropolitans in St Cyprian's time. He was undoubtedly one himself,[5] and Agrippinus, his predecessor, Bishop of Carthage, was one long before him. Spanhemius himself, our author's "Diligent Searcher into Antiquity," acknowledges it.[6] But to return from this digression.

[1] [There was great difficulty about admitting him to the Presbyterate, because he had received the Sacrament of Baptism on a sickbed. *Vide* p. 41.—E.]

[2] —Ut plebe præsente vel detegantur malorum crimina, vel bonorum merita prædicentur. Ep. 67, p. 172.

[3] Episcopus delegatur plebe præsente quæ singulorum vitam plenissime novit, &c. Ibid.

[4] Ep. 45, p. 87.

[5] De Cypriano Metropolitano, *Vide* Ep. 43, p. 82; Ep. 44, p. 85; Ep. 45, p. 87; Ep. 48, p. 91; Ep. 55, p. 110; Ep. 56, p. 116. Ep. 71, p. 196; Ep. 73, p. 199. De Agrippino. *Vide* etiam Conc. Carthag. ad initium.

[6] Metropolitanorum, seu Episcoporum in urbe matrice, vel prima sede,

Novatianus also, though illegally and schismatically ordained, found it necessary to send his communicatory letters to St Cyprian, as if he had been ordained canonically, and in the unity of the Church.[1] So also Fortunatus, when made a schismatical Bishop at Carthage, sent his communicatory letters to Cornelius, Bishop of Rome.[2] Indeed, this was never omitted.

4. If there was no competition, no controversy in the case, the matter was at an end. The promoted Bishop's communicatory letters were sufficient, and he was forthwith faithfully joined with all his colleagues, as St Cyprian words it.[3] But if there was any competitor, any debate, then, the rest of the College, before they received him as a colleague, made further enquiries. Sometimes they sent some from the neighbourhood to examine the matter; sometimes the ordainers were obliged to account for the person ordained, and the whole procedure of the ordination; sometimes both methods were practised. We have a famous instance of both methods in one case—the case of Cornelius and Novatianus. Cornelius, as I have said, upon his promotion, wrote to St Cyprian; so did Novatianus. Here was a competition. Cyprian, therefore, with his African colleagues, sent Caldonius and Fortunatus, two Bishops, to Rome, that upon the place itself, where they might have the surest information, they might enquire into the merits of the cause, and try the competition.[4] And, on the other hand, the sixteen Bishops who ordained Cornelius, wrote to St Cyprian and the rest of the Bishops of Africa, and satisfied them upon the whole question, demonstrating Cornelius's title, and condemning Novatianus.[5] Such care was taken that none should be admitted unworthily or uncanonically into the Episcopal college. But, then,

5. There was equal care taken to purge him out of the College again if he turned either heretical or schismatical—

sua fuerunt, hac ætate, supra reliquos ejusdem provinciæ jura. Spanhem Epit. Isag. ad Hist. Eccles. Nov. Test. Sæc. 3, sect. 6, p. 117.

[1] Ep. 44. p. 85. [2] Ep. 59, p. 135.

[3] Collegis omnibus fideliter junctus. Ep. 59, p. 130. [4] Ep. 45.

[5] Et factus est Episcopus a plurimis collegis nostris, qui tunc in urbe Roma aderant, qui ad nos literas honorificas et laudabiles, et testimonio suæ prædicationis illustres de ejus ordinatione miserunt. Ep. 55, p. 104.

if he kept not close to the laws of one faith and one communion. If he swerved from these he was forthwith refused the communion of the whole College. Therefore, says St Cyprian to Stephen, Bishop of Romé, in the case of Marcianus, Bishop of Arles, who had joined with Novatianus—"The corporation of Priests (the Episcopal college) is copious, being cemented by the glue of mutual concord and the bond of unity, that if any of the college shall turn heretic, or attempt to divide or waste the flock of Christ, the rest may interpose, and as profitable and merciful shepherds, collect our Lord's sheep and restore them to the flock."[1] And this they were bound to do by the fundamental laws of one church and one communion; for as our martyr subjoins—"Though they were many pastors, yet they all fed but one flock."[2] And therefore, all the Bishops in the world were bound to give the desolate Christians of churches, whereof the Bishops had turned heretical or schismatical, the comfort of their aid and assistance.[3] It is true no Bishop was superior to another Bishop in point of power or jurisdiction, but all stood collateral, as I have proved,[4] and so no Bishop, as superior to another in a straight line, could pass sentence on him, as they might have done to presbyters. Yet all being united into one college, which college was the principle of unity to the Church Catholick, it was necessary, as well as natural, that that college should be empowered to take care of its own preservation, and by consequence, they could do the equivalent of a formal and authoritative deposition; they could refuse the heretical or schismatical Bishop their communion, and thereby exclude him from the Episcopal college: and they could oblige all the Christians within his district to abandon his communion, and choose another Bishop, as they value the invaluable privileges of the one church, and the one communion. But then,

[1] Idcirco enim, Frater Carissime copiosum corpus est sacerdotum concordiæ mutuæ glutino, atque unitatis vinculo copulatum, ut si quis ex collegio nostro hæresin facere, et gregem Christi lacerare et vastare tentaverit, subveniant cæteri, et quasi pastores utiles et misericordes, oves Dominicas in gregem colligant. Ep. 68, p. 178.

[2] Nam etsi pastores multi sumus, unum tamen gregem pascimus. *Ibid.*

[3] — Solatium nostræ opitulationis —— *Ibid.* p. 177.

[4] *Vide supra*, p. 32.

6. So long as a Bishop, worthily and legally promoted, kept the faith and the unity of the Church, he was treated, he was encouraged, he was consulted, he was corresponded with—in a word, every way used as became the head of a particular Church, and a fellow-member of the College. All the rest of the members were bound by the fundamental laws of the College to ratify all his canonical, nay, equitable acts of priesthood, government, and discipline. Whosoever was baptized by himself, or by his clergy, with his allowance, was to be owned as a baptized Christian, a true denizen of the Church, and to have the privileges of such all the world over. Every Bishop of the Christian Church, living at how great a distance soever, was bound to communicate his dutiful subjects, duly attested by him, and to excommunicate his excommunicates. Thus for instance, Cornelius Bishop of Rome rejected Felicissimus and all his retainers, and Fortunatus and all his, and would not grant them his communion, because excommunicated by St Cyprian.[1] And Cyprian rejected Novatianus and all his party, because not in communion with Cornelius.[2] In short, by the laws of the College, he that was injurious, undutiful, or disobedient to his Bishop, was such to all the Bishops on earth: he that set up an altar against his Bishop's altar, set up his altar against the altars of the whole College: if a Bishop deposed or excommunicated any of his presbyters or deacons, it was not lawful for any other Bishop to receive him, nor to absolve him: he was still to be reserved for that to his own Bishop, so long as he lived. He that was reconciled to his Bishop, (whether he was of the clergy or laity), and restored by him to the peace of the Church, was thereby restored to the peace of all other Churches, and by consequence, of the Church Catholick. And of this we have a remarkable instance in St Cyprian's time. Therapius Bishop of Bulla, in the Proconsular province of Africa, absolved Victor, who had been a presbyter, but had fallen, in time of persecution, prematurely and uncanonically: and yet, by a synod of sixty-six Bishops, whereof Cyprian was one, the absolution was ratified, and Victor was allowed their communion; as we learn from their synodical epistle.[3]

[1] Ep. 59, p. 126. [2] Ep. 44.

[3] ——Librato apud nos diu consilio, satis fuit objurgare Therapium

So eminent and considerable was a Bishop then, as he stood related to the Catholick Church. Let me only add one thing more in pursuance of his dignity as to this relation; and that is,

7. That so long as a Bishop continued a sound member of the College, all informatory, consultatory, recommendatory, communicatory, congratulatory, apologetick, testimonial; in a word, all letters concerning the peace, the unity, the government, the discipline of the Church, or the concord, the correspondence, the harmony, the honour, the hazards, or any other considerable interest of the College, were directed to him, or received from him, as having the supreme power of the Church which he governed.

All the great concerns of both the Catholick Church and the Episcopal college, were, in these times, transacted by letters. There was no possibility of general councils then: all that could be done, was either to meet in provincial synods upon great emergencies, or, if that could not be neither, to transact matters and bring them to a general determination by particular letters from Bishop to Bishop.

Provincial synods were ordinarily kept twice a year, and by them, in the ordinary course, all matters of moment were determined; and so by the reciprocation of synodical letters, matters came sometimes to such a general agreement and determination, as in the result was fully equivalent to the definition of a general council. We have several instances of such transactions by provincial synods. Thus, in the grand case of the lapsed in the time of the Decian persecution, the matter was so managed by provincial synods in Africa, Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, &c., that at last, as St Cyprian tell us, it was brought to this general conclusion, that the lapsed should complete their terms of penance, and should not be restored to the peace of the Church before the time appointed by the Canons, unless it was in the case of deadly sickness.[1] Thus, without doubt, also that considerable

collegam nostrum, quod temere hoc fecerit———Pacem tamen quomodocunque a Sacerdote Dei semel datam non putavimus auferendam, ac per hoc Victori communicationem sibi concessam usurpare permisimus. Ep. 64, p. 158.

[1] Ep. 55, p. 102, 103. [This is not a verbal translation of the passages quoted, but it correctly conveys the meaning.—E.]

Canon mentioned by St Cyprian in the synodical epistle, which is the 67th in number, amongst his epistles, viz. That the lapsed, however they might be restored to the communion of the Church, should never be received into holy orders.[1] And that other Canon mentioned by him also, that no clergymen should be tutor to minors.[2] Thus also, long before St Cyprian, the great controversy concerning the observation of Easter,[3] was managed in many synods, as Eusebius tells us.[4] And a few years after his martyrdom, the case of the Paulus Samosatenus.[5] These instances are only for a sample.

[1] [Ab ordinatione autem cleri atque sacerdotali honore prohiberi. Ep. 67, p. 174.—E.]

[2] Ep. 1, p. 1.—[The object of this enactment, which appears strange to us, was to protect the clergy from such heavy responsibilities. By the Roman law, scarce any excuse was admitted as sufficient to exonerate persons from tutorage, it being considered a duty *pro bono publico*. But as Christian Priests found their spiritual avocations at that period quite arduous enough of themselves, it was considered expedient to make an enactment which would at least prevent members of the Church from imposing an extra burden of this sort on their clergy. This law, which was at first private, when the Empire became Christian, and the State allied itself with the Church, was ratified by public authority, and clerics were excused from a duty which was imperatively required to be performed by every other citizen. It seems, however, that though thus excused, they afterwards mixed themselves up so with secular affairs, that it became necessary positively to prohibit them from undertaking the tutorship of minors. To this effect we have both the decrees of Synods and the edicts of Princes. *Vide* annotationem Felli, in 1 Ep. p. 1.—E.]

[3] [The controversy was between the Asiatic and Western Churches, and related to the *time* for keeping Easter. The former, pleading Apostolical practice, observed it on the same day upon which the Jews kept their Passover; the latter, on the first Lord's day after the Passover. This subject of debate, which originated in the early part of the second century, was settled by the decision of the great Council of Nice against the Asiatics. In the middle of the seventh century, however, we find this controversy existing in Britain. The Scots, from their remote situation, do not seem to have been aware of the decree of the Nicene Council, and their Bishops and Clergy for a time opposed the Catholic rule, brought over by the later missionaries from Rome. *Vide* Collier's Hist. vol. i. p. 95, &c. &c. and Russell's Prelim. Dissert. to Keith's Catal. p. 75.—E.]

[4] *Vide* Euseb. H. E. l. 5, ad c. 23, ad c. 28. [Ed. Col. Allob. l. 5, cc. 22, 23, 24.—E.]

[5] Euseb. l. 7, c. 30.—[Ed. Col. Allob. l. 7, c. 22. Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, a heretic, who denied the distinct personality of the blessed Trinity, and the Divine nature of our Lord. He was excommunicated by a Council, consisting of seventy Oriental Prelates, held at Antioch, A. D. 270.—E.]

When provincial synods could not be kept, or emergent matters of consequence could not be conveniently determined in them, then recourse was had to the only remaining method, viz. particular letters from Bishop to Bishop. And to make this method both sure and effectual, all possible pains was taken. It was necessary that each Bishop should sign his letter, and send it, not by every common carrier, but by a clergyman.[1] In short, they had such marks, that it was not easy, if possible, to counterfeit them. And the Bishop, who received it, was bound by the laws of the college to transmit it, for his share, to the rest of the members. And so it went through, and the whole college was acquainted with the accident, the case, the controversy, whatever it was that had emerged; we have many instances and evidences of this method and diligence in St Cyprian's writings. Thus, *e. g.* when Caldonius writes to Cyprian concerning some lapsed within his district, Cyprian returns him an answer, telling him he had written his mind to that purpose already, and so sends him copies of five epistles concerning the case, requiring him to transmit them to as many Bishops as he could; adding this as the reason, "that one course, one resolution, might be kept by all the college."[2] And so we find that the letters written by him about that controversy were transmitted from hand to hand till they were dispersed all the world over.[3] Thus, I say, sometimes the greatest affairs of the Church were managed: and 'tis plain this method was every way equivalent, if not preferable, to a general council: so that the Christian Church might have still subsisted, and its unity been provided for, and preserved in all ages, without such councils, as it was effectually during the first three centuries. Now that which I am principally concerned for in all this matter is,

That all these circular letters, of whatsoever nature, relat-

[1] Et quoniam oportuit me per Clericos scribere —— Ep. 29, p. 55.

[2] Librum tibi cum epistolis numero quinque misi —— Quæ epistolæ jam plurimis collegis nostris missæ placuerunt, et rescripserunt se quoque nobiscum in eodem consilio secundum Catholicam fidem stare. Quod ipsum etiam tu ad collegas nostros, quos potueris, transmitte; ut apud omnes unus actus, et una consensio secundum domini præcepta, teneatur. Ep. 25, p. 50.

[3] Ep. 55, p. 102.

ing either to the great interests of the Catholick Church, or of the Episcopal College, were regularly directed only to the Bishops, as being the heads and principles of unity to their respective Churches, as well as written and sent by those of the same order. And we have a notable account of this in St Cyprian's 48th Epistle directed to Cornelius: for there we learn, that the presbyters and deacons of the Church of Adrumetum, having received Cornelius's communicatory letters, directed to Polycarpus their Bishop, and seeing their Bishop was absent, finding it necessary that they should return an answer in his name, as having his presumed allowance for it, they wrote to Cornelius in the common form, acknowledging him as Bishop of Rome, and subjoining Polycarpus his name to the letter. A clear evidence that where there was a Bishop, it behoved all the letters that concerned the public state of the Church to be subscribed by him—no other name but his could give them force and make them current. Well! but there was one thing amiss: St Cyprian and the rest of the African Bishops having intelligence of the competition that was at Rome between Cornelius and Novatianus, and being unwilling to do any thing rashly, had determined to continue to write only to the Roman presbyters and deacons, as before, during the vacancy, till Cornelius his title should be fully cleared to them. This the clergy of Adrumetum were ignorant of, when they wrote the above mentioned letter. And being afterwards told it by Cyprian and Liberalis, they directed their next letter not for Cornelius but for the Roman presbyters and deacons. Hereat Cornelius was not a little stumbled, and according to the then current principles, interpreting it to be a disowning of him as Bishop of Rome, he wrote a letter of complaint to Cyprian about it, who was then Metropolitan of that province. In answer to which our holy martyr wrote a full apology to him, shewing him what was true matter of fact; upon what reasons the Bishops of Africa had taken the aforesaid resolutions; how it was in consequence of that resolution that the clergy of Adrumetum had changed their direction; and how, by the whole method, nothing was less intended than to disown him as Bishop of Rome, or invalidate his title. And was there not here as clear an evidence that regularly, and in

the current form, all letters were directed to the Bishop! Shall I give you another history to clear this matter further? When Maximus and Nicrostratus, retaining to Novatianus, and so separating from Cornelius, did thereby cut themselves off from the communion of the Church, Cyprian wrote to them, as well he might, considering that his design was to reconcile them to their true Bishop Cornelius; but how did he write? Why? so as that his letter should not be delivered till Cornelius should see it, and judge whether it was proper to deliver it.[1] Such a special regard was then paid to the Bishop of a Church, as being supreme in it, and the principle of unity to it.

If all this doth not satisfy you, then listen a little further, and resist *this* evidence if ye can: because, by the fundamental principles of one faith and one communion, every heretical and schismatical Bishop was, *ipso facto*, out of the Church, and all who retained or adhered to him, whether Bishops, clergy, or laicks, did run the same risk with him. Therefore, so soon as any Bishop turned heretic or schismatic, the Catholick Bishops of the province, especially the Metropolitans, formed lists of all the true, orthodox, and Catholick Bishops, within their respective provinces, and sent them to other Metropolitans; and so they were transmitted all the world over: That their communicatory letters, and theirs only, might be received, and their communion, and theirs only, might be allowed, and that all heretical or schismatical, or retainers to heretical or schismatical Bishops, might be rejected, and their communion refused. And for this we have two notable testimonies from St Cyprian, the one is in his 59th Epistle directed to Cornelius, where he tells him—"That upon Fortunatus his starting out of the Church, and pretending to be Bishop of Carthage, he had sent him the names of all the Bishops in Africa who governed their Churches in soundness and integrity, and that it was done by common advice: but to what purpose? that you and all my colleagues may readily know to whom you may send, and from whom you may receive communicatory letters."[2] The other testimony is in

[1] Ep. 47.

[2] ——Et miserim tibi proxime nomina Episcoporum istic constitutorum, qui integri et sani in Ecclesia catholica fratribus præsunt. Quod

Epistle 68, where Cyprian having given his sentiments fully concerning Marcianus, that he had forfeited his dignity, and that it was necessary that another should be substituted in his room, &c. requires Stephen Bishop of Rome to give himself and the rest of the Bishops of Africa a distinct account of the person that should be surrogated in Marcianus his place—"That we may know," say he, "to whom we may direct our brethren, and write our letters."[1]

I have only given you a taste of the methods and expedients which were put in practice in those times for preserving the unity, the one communion of the one Catholick Church; and how nicely and accurately it was provided for, by the incorporation of all Bishops into one college; of all particular principles of unity of particular Churches into one aggregated principle of unity, proportioned to the extent of all those Churches in their aggregation, and by the mutual support of all Bishops one towards another. It had been easy to have collected more particulars, as well as to have insisted more largely on these I have collected. But from the small collection I have made, I think I have laid foundation enough for another demonstration against our author's notion of a Bishop in St Cyprian's time. For

How could either single presbyter, or Presbyterian moderator, taking the terms in the Presbyterian sense, have borne such a part in relation to the unity of the Catholick Church and the preservation of one communion? Besides, that the College of Bishops, in those times, is still considered and insisted on, as consisting of church governours notoriously distinguished from presbyters: Besides, that in all St Cyprian's writings, or in any monument of those times, you shall never so much as once find a Bishop calling a presbyter his colleague. Besides, that we have not the least vestige of any such stated ordinary current office in any record of those times, as that of a mere Presbyterian moderator. Besides these things, I say,

utique ideo de omnium nostrorum consilio placuit scribere; ut erroris diluendi———compendium fieret, et scires tu et collegæ nostri, quibus scribere, et literas mutuo a quibus vos accipere oporteret. Ep. 59, p. 132.

[1] Significa plane nobis quis in locum Marciani Arelate fuerit substitutus, ut sciamus ad quem fratres nostros dirigere, et cui scribere debeamus. Ep. 68, p. 179.

How had it been consistent with the principles or analogies, the scheme or plot of Presbyterian parity, to have committed to any single presbyter, moderator, or other, the bearing of such a part, as that he, and he alone, of God knows how many, should have been constituted a member of a college, which college, and which alone, had the supreme power of preserving the faith and the unity, and managing all the affairs of the Church Catholick? As that all his admissions into the Church—his exclusions from the Church—his extrusions out of the Church—his suspensions, his abstentions, his excommunications, his injunctions of penances, his absolutions, his ordinations, his degradations, his depositions; in a word, all his acts of government and discipline within his own district, and his alone, should have had authority, and been deemed valid, and merited a ratification all the world over? As that whosoever, presbyter or other, within such a district, in which there might have been many decades of presbyters, was disobedient to him, or top't it with him, or rebelled against him, should have been reputed disobedient to, and rebellious against, the whole College of the Supreme Governours of the Church Catholick? As that raising an altar against his altar, and his only, should have been deemed raising an altar against all Catholick Christian altars? As that from him, and from him only, in the regular course, all communicatory, informatory, consolatory—in short, all letters concerning the public affairs of the Catholick Church, or the sacred College that ruled the Catholick Church, should have been received? As that to him, and to him alone, all such letters have been directed? As that by the circulation and reciprocation of letters betwixt him and his colleagues, and their general agreement upon any thing, by that circulation and reciprocation, laws should have been given to the whole Catholick Church, canons as binding and obligatory as the supreme ecclesiastical power on earth could make them? How could one raised to such a post, I say, have been no other than a single presbyter, or a Presbyterian moderator? Doth not his very bearing such a part, his having such a trust, his being clothed with such an eminence, argue him demonstratively to have been something other, something greater, something higher and more honourable than either?

Thus I have considered a Bishop in St Cyprian's time, as he stood related to his own particular, and to the Church Catholick; and, in both respects, have discovered a vast discrepance betwixt him, as *he was really*, and our author's notion or definition of him. Let me only add one consideration more; and that is—

What character he bore, what figure he made, in the eye of those who were without; of the heathen world, especially the Roman emperours and magistrates. And here I need not be at much pains; the thing is obvious:—the Christian Bishops, as being the chief rulers, the supreme governours, the heads of their respective churches, were the chief butts of all the heathen rage and malice. Take these few of many evidences.

After St Cyprian had retired from Carthage, in the time of the Decian Persecution, he wrote to his presbyters and deacons, and told them how earnest he was to return to the city, but prudence would not let him. When he considered the public peace of the Church, and how much he, as Bishop, was concerned to provide for it, and for the quiet and safety of the brethren, he found it necessary for him, though with mighty grief, to forbear returning for a time, "lest *his presence* should provoke the rage and fury of the Gentiles." So he wrote, I say, in his 7th Epistle.[1] And in the 12th, directed also to his presbyters and deacons—"I wish," says he, "that my station and character would allow me to be present with you."[2] In his 20th Epistle directed for the Roman presbyters and deacons, he apologizes for his retirement after this manner:—"In compliance with our Lord's commands," pointing no doubt at Matth. x. 23, "so soon as the persecution began, and the rabble, with mighty clamour, pursued me, I retired for a time, not so much to save myself, as for the public quiet of the Church, and the tumult which was already kindled, might not be the more inflamed by *my obstinate presence*.[3] And to the same pur-

[1] Oportet nos tamen paci communi consulere, et interdum, quamvis cum tædio animi nostri, deesse vobis, ne *præsentia nostri invidiam et violentiam gentilium provocet*. Ep. 7, p. 14.

[2] Atque utinam *loci et gradus* mei conditio permitteret, ut *ipse præsens* esse possem. Ep. 12, p. 27.

[3] Nam sicut Domini mandata instruunt, orto statim turbationis impetu primo, cum *me* clamore violento frequenter populus flagitasset, non tam

pose he apologizes to his own people for his so long absence, Ep. 43. Though he had been long away, yet he durst not return, because of the threats and snares of these perfidious men, Felicissimus and his fellow-schismatics—" Lest," says he, " upon *my coming*, there should be a greater uproar, and while, as a Bishop ought in all things to provide for peace and tranquillity, I should seem to have added fuel to the sedition, and to have imbittered the persecution." [1]

Here, I think, is clear demonstration of the Episcopal eminence in the eye of the heathen persecutors. It was a grief, a burden, a torment, a very crucifixion to St Cyprian's soul, to be separated from his flock, as himself words it.[2] But he was bound by the laws of his *Episcopal providence*, by all means to study the peace, the quiet, the tranquillity of the Church; and his *locus* and *gradus*, his station and dignity, were so conspicuous and eminent, that *his presence* would have provoked the Gentiles, and increased the persecution, and therefore he durst not return. And yet this is not all. Consider if what follows is not yet clearer.

In his fourteenth Epistle written to his presbyters and deacons, he tells them that though he had strong and pressing reasons to hasten his return, yet he found it more expedient and useful for the public peace to continue longer in his lurking places; and Tertullus, one whom they knew, and could not but value, had seriously advised him to be calm and cautious, and not to commit himself rashly to the public view, especially of that place where he had been so often lain in wait, and made search for; and therefore he exhorts and commands them, (his presbyters and deacons), " That *they* whose *presence* was neither so *invidious*, nor by far so *dangerous*, might perform the part of vicars to him." [3]

meam salutem quam quietem fratrum publicam cogitans, interim secessi ne per *inverecundam præsentiam nostram*, seditio, quæ cæperat, plus provocaretur. Ep. 20, p. 42.

[1] Accessit hic tabescenti animo nostro dolor major, quod in tanta solicitudine ac necessitate excurrere ad vos *ipse* non possum, dum per minas et per insidias perfidorum cavemus, ne *advenientibus nobis* tumultus illic major oriatur; et cum paci et tranquillitati *Episcopus* providere in omnibus debeat, *ipse* materiam seditioni dedisse, et persecutionem denuo exacerbasse videatur. Ep. 43, p. 83.

[2] Ep. 43, p. 83.

[3] —— a Tertullo— qui——etiam hujus consilii auctor fuit, ut cautus et moderatus existerem, nec me in conspectum publicum, et maxime ejus

Here, I think, we have a full evidence of a fair discrimination was made betwixt him and his presbyters by the heathen persecutors. And not only so, but he tells Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, Epistle 59—" That he was proscribed in the days of the Decian Persecution, and that by name, as Bishop of the Christians in Carthage, and that he was destined for the lions," &c.[1] And again, Epistle 66, he tells Florentius Pupianus that his proscription ran in this form:—" If any man holds or possesses any of the goods of *Cæcilius Cyprianus, Bishop of the Christians*," &c. And thereby makes an argument, that it was unaccountable in Florentius not to own him as a Bishop.[2] And Pontius his deacon tells us—" That when he at last commenced martyr in the Valerian Persecution, in the very sentence that was given out against him, he was called *Sectæ Signifer*, the ringleader, the head, the chieftain of the sect of the Christians in Carthage." Would you have yet more?[3] Then take it, not about St Cyprian's person, for I think we have enough of him already, but in St Cyprian's words, you have them in Epistle 55; there he tells Antonianus—" That the Emperour Decius"—from a sense, no doubt, that as heads of their respective Churches, they were, under God, the great supporters and promoters of our most holy faith—had such a spite, such a pique, at the Christian Bishops, that for example he could have heard, with greater patience and composure, that another emulous prince should have rivalled it with him for the Roman Empire, than that a Bishop should have been settled in the city of Rome."[4] And doth not Eusebius tell us, " That the Emperor Maximinus, in that persecution of which he was the author, some twenty-

loci, ubi toties flagitatus et quæsitus fuissem, temere committerem. Fretus ergo et dilectione et religione vestra, quam satis novi, his literis et hortor et mando, ut *vos* quorum minime illic *invidiosa*, et non adeo *periculosa præsentia* est, *vice mea* fungamini, &c. Ep. 14, p. 31.

[1] —— in tempestate proscriptus, applicito et adjuncto *episcopatus* sui *nomine*; toties ad leonem petitus, &c. Ep. 59, p. 130.

[2] Si quis tenet vel possidet de bonis Cæcilii Cypriani Episcopi Christianorum; ut etiam qui non credebant Deo Episcopum constituenti, vel Diabolo crederent Episcopum proscribenti. Ep. 66, p. 166.

[3] *Vide* Pont. in vita Cyp. p. 9, 10.

[4] Cum multo patientius atque tolerabilius audiret, levari adversus se æmulum principem, quam constitui Romæ Dei Sacerdotem. Ep. 55, p. 104.

two or twenty-three years before St Cyprian's martyrdom, ordered that the "Ἀρχοντες, the chief governours of the Christian Churches, should only be put to death, as being the authors of the propagation of the gospel?" [1] So eminent in those times was the Episcopal character—such a sense had the very heathens of their being Bishops indeed, so much, as *Bishops*, were they obnoxious to the fury and malice of persecutors, and so much reason had St Cyprian to say—"That it mattered not whence (whether from heathens without, or schismatics within, if they may be called any way within), terrors or perils threatened a *Bishop*, seeing, *as such*, he was still obnoxious to terrors or perils." [2] Meaning that in those times, Bishops, *as Bishops*, were still exposed to the first burnt of all persecutions. As, on the other hand, when the humane Gallienus, who succeeded to Valerianus, stopped the persecution which his predecessor had begun, he began his imperial rescript thus—"The Emperor Publius Licinus Gallienus, &c. to Dionysius, Pinnas, Demetrius, and the rest of the *Bishops*," &c. and so went on, telling them how he had ordered his edict of grace and clemency to be published all the world over, allowing them to rely upon it as full security against all molestation for the future.[3] Thus, I say, that heathen Emperor stopping the current of a fierce persecution, and designing favour and security to Christians, directed his letters to the Christian Bishops, as the persons who were heads of the Christian Churches, and in all persecutions had wont to be exposed to the greatest hazards.

Thus, Sir, I have examined our author's definition of a Bishop in St Cyprian's time, and if I mistake not, have demonstrated by many solid arguments that he was neither single presbyter, nor Presbyterian moderator, in the Presbyterian sense of the term, but a true Prelate in the strictest propriety of speech. Consider my arguments thoroughly,

[1] Τοὺς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν Ἄρχοντας μόνους ὡς αἰτίους τῆς κατὰ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον διδασκαλίας, ἀναιρεῖσθαι κρίσαντες Euseb. H. E. l. 6, c. 24.—[Ed. Coll. Allob. c. 21.—E.]

[2] Nec interest unde Episcopo aut terror aut periculum veniat, qui terroribus et periculis vivit obnoxius. Ep. 59, p. 126.

[3] Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Πούπλιος Λικίνιος Γαλλιηνὸς, &c Διονυσίῳ καὶ Πίννᾳ καὶ Δημητρίῳ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΙΣ, &c. Euseb. l. 7, c. 13.—[Ed. Coll. Allob. c. 12.—E.]

and weigh them only in the balance of justice, without prejudice and without partiality, and try whether each of them singly, and much more, all together, do not conclude irrefragably against him. And if they shall be found to be concludent, I leave it next to you to determine whether our author is not both fairly and formally bound by his word to confess himself a schismatic.

When I first put pen to paper I had in my project to have proceeded further, and made it appear as evidently as what I have now despatched, that the Episcopal preeminence, which was so notoriously and unquestionably prelatical in St Cyprian's time, was no novel usurpation, no late invention, not at all the production of the Cyprianic age, nor any age later than the Apostles: that St Cyprian, and all his contemporaries, firmly believed it to be of divine institution; that they had not entertained it, having so little temporal encouragement, nay, so great and many temporal discouragements to entertain it, if they had not so believed: that they had great reason for this their belief, as fairly founded on our Saviour's own ordinance; and fully handed down to them in the constant practice of the universal Church from the first plantation of Christian Churches; that it passed amongst them as a common principle that Bishops as I have represented them, Bishops as they were were then, that is, clearly contradistinct from presbyters, and superior to them, Bishops as the heads of, and principles of unity to, their respective Churches, were the rightful, true, and genuine successors of the Apostles in the supreme visible ecclesiastical power of governing the Churches, whereof they were Bishops.

These things, I say, I had once in my prospect; but this letter has swelled to such a bulk already, as perhaps may fright you from reading it; and you may command me to prosecute what is left undone when you will; and what I have written, as I said, seems to me sufficient, in point of argument, for bringing your author to a sense of his state, as well as a candid confession of it, when it is thus plainly represented to him; and therefore I conclude with my best Christian wishes to you and him, and all men.

March 28, 1695.

[At page 11 there is a reference to the "Sanquhar Declaration," extracts from which I here subjoin, quoted verbatim from the Appendix to Wodrow's Church History. It will be remembered that this "Declaration" was issued by Cameron and his adherents, who refused to accept the "Black Indulgence," and derives its name from a burgh in Dumfriesshire, where the rebels were assembled in arms.

"It is not amongst the smallest of the Lord's mercies to this poor land, that there have been always some who have given their testimony against every course of defection, (that many are guilty of), which is a token for good, that He doth not as yet intend to cast us off altogether, but that He will leave a remnant in whom He will be glorious, if they, through His grace, keep themselves clean still, and walk in His way and method, as it has been walked in and owned by Him in our predecessors of truly worthy memory, in their carrying on of our noble work of reformation in the several steps thereof, from Popery, Prelacy, and likewise Erastian supremacy, so much usurped by him who (*'tis true, so far as we know*), is descended from the race of our Kings, yet in truth, so far descended from what he ought to have been, by his perjury and usurpation in Church matters, and tyranny in matters civil, as is known by the whole land, that we have just reason to account it one of the Lord's great controversies against us, that we have not disowned Him and the men of his practices, (whether inferior magistrates or any other), as enemies to our Lord and His Crown, and the true Protestant and Presbyterian interest in this land—our Lord's espoused Bride and Church. Therefore, altho' we be for government and governors—such as the WORD OF GOD and OUR COVENANT allows, yet we for ourselves, and all that will adhere to us, as the representatives of the true Presbyterian Kirk and Covenanted Nation of Scotland —— do by thir presents DISOWN CHARLES STUART, that has been reigning, (or rather tyrannizing, as we may say), on the Throne of Britain these years bygone, as having any right, title to, or interest in the said Crown of Scotland for government, as forfeited several years since by his perjury and breach of Covenant with God and His Kirk ——. As also, we being under THE STANDARD OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, Captain of our Salvation, do declare a war with such a tyrant and usurper, and all men of his practices, as enemies to our Lord Jesus Christ, his cause and covenants, &c. As also, we disown, and by this resent the reception of the Duke of York, that profest Papist, as repugnant to our principles, and vows to the most High God, &c. We also, by this, protest against his succeeding to the Crown, &c. ——"

Whatever be the opinion which we may form of this document, it is historically useful, as affording no small palliation for the severity of the government of that day, and as tending to remove that romantic, but mistaken, sympathy with the Covenanters, which is found to exist in many minds, and to operate badly in several important ways.—E.]

A

VINDICATION

OF A

DISCOURSE

ENTITULED

THE PRINCIPLES OF THE CYPRIANIC AGE,

WITH REGARD TO

EPISCOPAL POWER AND JURISDICTION;

BEING A REPLY TO GILBERT RULE'S "CYPRIANIC BISHOP EXAMINED AND FOUND NOT TO BE A DIOCESAN."

WHEREIN

BESIDES A GREAT MANY THINGS MORE BRIEFLY CONSIDERED, THE USEFULNESS OF FIXING THE PRINCIPLES OF THE CYPRIANIC AGE IS SUCCINCTLY REPRESENTED; THE MAIN CONTROVERSY BETWEEN THOSE OF THE CHURCH AND THE PRESBYTERIANS IS FULLY AND DISTINCTLY STATED; MR RULE'S MAIN SUBTERFUGES ARE UTTERLY OVERTHROWN; LARGE SUPPLEMENTS ARE ADDED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE CYPRIANIC AGE; THE CYPRIANIC EPISCOPACY IS SHEWN TO BE INCONSISTENT WITH A PAPACY; AND IT IS DEMONSTRATED THAT EPISCOPAL GOVERNMENT WAS UNIVERSALLY DELIVERED TO BE OF DIVINE RIGHT IN THE DAYS OF ST CYPRIAN.

——Οὓς δεῖ ἐπιστομίζειν—Tit. I, 2.

LONDON:

PRINTED BY G. CROOM, FOR ROBERT CLAVEL, AT THE PEACOCK, AT THE WEST END OF ST PAUL'S, AND GEORGE STRAHAN, AT THE GOLDEN BALL, OVER AGAINST THE ROYAL EXCHANGE.

MDCCI.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

THE OCCASION AND REASONS OF COLLECTING THE PRINCIPLES OF THE CYPRIANIC AGE,—P. 1–34.

The occasion of collecting them, Sect. I, II.
The provocation given by G[ilbert] R[ule] made it reasonable to collect them, Sect. III, IV, V, VI, VII.

Other reasons for collecting them, particularly—

I. Collected to shew the usefulness of divers Presbyterian subterfuges, Sect. VIII, IX.
II. To shew that our Scottish Presbyterian authors abuse the people by giving them to believe that Episcopacy is a late innovation, which prevailed not in the first three centuries. How earnest our brethren are in this matter, proved by instances from Sect. XI to Sect. XXVII.
III. The Principles of the Cyprianic Age useful for determining the controversy about the sentiments of our Reformers concerning Church Government, Sect. XXVIII, XXIX.

The Cyprianic Age, how peculiarly fitted for answering these ends, as being—

1. An age that afforded no secular temptations to aspire to the Episcopal pre-eminence, Sect. XXX.
2. An age of much Ecclesiastical business, Sect. XXXI.
3. An age of great men, Sect. XXXII.
4. An age that affords many excellent records, Sect. XXXIII.
5. An age wherein the extraordinary manifestations of the Spirit continued to be frequent, Sect. XXXIV.
6. An age so near to the Apostolic age, as that those who lived in it might have certainly known what form of government was left by the Apostles, Sect. XXXV.

How observable alterations in Church Government, Sect. XXXVI.
The Christians of the Cyprianic Age bound by principle to avoid innovations, Sect. XXXVII.
And by interest, Sect. XXXVIII, XXXIX.

The time between St John's death and St Cyprian's promotion to the See of Carthage, not so long but that such remarkable events as the alteration of the instituted forms of government might have been certainly traced, Sect. XL, XLI.
How easy it was then to have traced them if there had been any such alterations, Sect. XLII, XLIII.
Even by oral tradition, Sect. XLIV, XLV, XLVI, XLVII.
As easy to have traced them as for us to trace the alterations, whether in Church or State, since the beginning of the Reformation of religion in Scotland, Sect. XLVIII, XLXIX, L.
G[ilbert] R[ule] bound to acknowledge the certainty of even oral tradition for such a time, Sect. LI.
The serviceableness of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age being once fixed, for the aforementioned three ends, Sect. LII, LIII, LIV, LV, LVI, LVII, LVIII.

IV. A fourth reason for collecting them, Sect. LIX.
How they came to be published, Sect. LX, LXI.
Two Amendments made in them, Sect. LXII, LXIII.

CHAPTER II.

THIS VINDICATION, HOWEVER SIMPLY UNNECESSARY, YET IN A MANNER NEEDFUL FOR STOPPING THE MOUTHS OF OUR PRESBYTERIAN ADVERSARIES,—P. 35–77.

This Vindication not simply necessary; because—

I. G[ilbert] R[ule] has really (though unwillingly) acknowledged proper Prelacy to have obtained in St Cyprian's time, Sect. I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X.
II. More than probable that G[ilbert] R[ule] had never read St Cyprian's works before he wrote his Second Vindication, Sect. XI.
Nay probable, he had not read them when he wrote his "Cyprianic Bishop Examined," Sect. XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI.
The edition of St Cyprian's works made use of by J[ohn] S[age] accounted for, Sect. XVII.
III. G[ilbert] R[ule] so notoriously inhuman and unjust to J[ohn] S[age] as to make this Vindication unnecessary, Sect. XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII.
IV. Such a specimen of G[ilbert] R[ule]'s abilities at reasoning as may make this Vindication unnecessary, from Sect. XXIV to XXXVI.
V. G[ilbert] R[ule] has not shewn any such skill in the matter of books as may make this Vindication necessary; see his blunders
About Walo Messalinus, Sect. XXXVII.
And Cornelius's Epistle to Fabius of Antioch, Sect. XXXVIII.
And Eusebius's History, Sect. XXXIX.
A specimen of Mr Forrester's skill in antiquity, Sect. XL.
G[ilbert] R[ule]'s blunder about Clemens Romanus his first Epistle to the Corinthians, Sect. XLI.

His desperate attempt on St Cyprian's Epistles, Sect. XLII.

VI. A specimen of G[ilbert] R[ule]'s skill in recommending books, particularly—

Paul Bayn's "Diocesan's Trial"—a brief account of this book; and the author proved to have been an Independent, Sect. XLIII, XLIV, XLV.

And to have manifestly contradicted G[ilbert] R[ule], Sect. XLVI.

Another instance in Mr Peregrine's "Letters-Patents for Presbytery," and an account of this book, from Sect. XLVII to LV.

The reasons of writing this Vindication, and a specimen of the boastings of Scottish Presbyterians when their books are not answered, from Sect. LV to LXVI.

A brief scheme of this Vindication, Sect. LXIX.

A suit to such as shall incline to reply to it, Sect. LXX.

CHAPTER III.

EPISCOPACY ACKNOWLEDGED BY MANY LEARNED PRESBYTERIANS TO HAVE BEEN IN THE CHURCH IN ST CYPRIAN'S TIME,—P. 78–132.

The provocation given by G[ilbert] R[ule] to insist on this argument, Sect. I.

Chamier acknowledges proper Prelacy to have been in St Cyprian's time, Sect. II, III, IV.

The Presbyterian principle, that from the beginning Moderators of Presbyteries had a priority of dignity, quite routs [Gilbert] R[ule], Sect. V.

The imputation of Church domination to Bishops ridiculous, Sect. VI, VII.

G[ilbert] R[ule]'s mistakes about "Blondel's Apology" represented, Sect. IX.

The design of "Blondel's Apology," &c., Sect. X.

Blondel peremptory for constant Moderators from the beginning, Sect. XI.

His account of the manner of their succession, Sect. XII.

How this is subservient to his main design, Sect. XIII.

Blondel questions not the lawfulness of Episcopacy, Sect. XIV, XV.

He acknowledges imparity from the beginning, Sect. XVI, XVII.

G[ilbert] R[ule] has miserably mistaken some passages in Blondel, Sect. XVIII.

Blondel's ample concessions of Episcopacy in St Cyprian's time, Sect. XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV.

Salmasius his concessions of Episcopacy in St Cyprian s time, Sect. XXV. XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXX, XXXI, XXXII.

G[ilbert] R[ule]'s mistake about Salmasius, Sect. XXXIII.

Probably principles were concerted between Blondel and Salmasius, Sect. XXXIV.
The concessions of the Provincial Assembly of London, Sect. XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII.
The concessions of Fredericus Spanhemius, Sect. XXXVIII.
J[ohn] S[age] did no injustice to Spanhemius, Sect. XXXIX, XL, XLI.
A transition to other authors, Sect. XLII.
Calvin's fair concessions of Episcopacy in St Cyprian's time, Sect. XLIII.
Beza's, Sect. XLIV.
Antonius Sadeel's concessions, Sect. XLV.
Franciscus Junius's, Sect. XLVI.
The concessions of the Centuriators of Magdeburgh, Sect. XLVII.
Of Gersom Bucer, Sect. XLVIII.
Of Petrus Molinæus, Sect. XLIX.
Of Paul Bayn, Sect. L.
Of Mr Peregrine, Sect. LI.
Of Joannes Henricus Alstedius, Sect. LII.
Of Andreas Rivetus, Sect. LIII.
Of Smectymnuus, Sect. LIV.
Of the publishers of the "English Annotations," Sect. LV.
Of the Divines at Newport in the Isle of Wight, Sect. LVI.
Of Ludovicus Capellus, Sect. LVII.
Of Moyses Amyraldus, Sect. LVIII.
Of Albertinus, Sect. LIX.
Of Samuel Bochartus, Sect. LX.
Of Joannes Hoornbeek, Sect. LXI.
Of Joannes Dallæus, Sect. LXII.
f the anonymous author of the "Observations on Dr Pearson's Vindication of Ignatius's Epistles," &c., Sect. LXIII.
Of Franciscus Turretinus, Sect. LXIV.
Of Melchior Leideckerus, Sect. LXV, LXVI, LXVII.
Of the author of the "Case of Accommodation," Sect. LXVIII.
Of other Thirty-nine Presbyterian authors referred to, Sect. LXIX.
All the true disciples of Beza, Blondel, Salmasius, &c. bound to own Episcopacy to have been in St Cyprian's time, Sect. LXXI.
And all the disciples of St Jerome, LXXII.
And all who make Prelacy the mystery of iniquity, Sect. LXXIII.
It must be a real majority of power, and not of bare dignity, that must be acknowledged by all the above mentioned authors, Sect. LXXIV.
Constant Moderators from the beginning, acknowledged by the learnedest of the above mentioned authors, *ibid.*
The force of this argument taken from the concessions of learned Presbyterians, and how irresistibly it concludes against G[ilbert] R[ule], Sect. LXXV, LXXVI, LXXVII.

CHAPTER IV.

THE TRUE STATE OF THE MAIN CONTROVERSY BETWEEN US AND THE PRESBYTERIANS FIXED, AND THEREBY THE UNSERVICEABLENESS OF ONE OF G[ILBERT] R[ULE]'S MAIN SUBTERFUGES FULLY REPRESENTED,—P. 133–207.

The subterfuge is, that such an argument or authority doth not infer that in St Cyprian's time the Bishops had the *sole power* of ordination and jurisdiction, Sect. I.

This subterfuge industriously excluded by J[ohn] S[age] in the "Principles of the Cyprianic Age," Sect. II.

G[ilbert] Rule very angry at J[ohn] S[age]'s (and no wonder, considering how much depends on the true state of it) stating of the main controversy, Sect. III, IV.

G[ilbert] R[ule] attacks J[ohn] S[age]'s state of the main controversy four ways, Sect. V.

I. He (in vain) would have J[ohn] S[age]'s distinctions useless and inapplicable, Sect. VI, VII, VIII, IX.

II. He (unsuccessfully) would have J[ohn] S[age]'s state of the main controversy inconsistent with the main design of his book, Sect. X, XI.

III. He attempts (as unsuccessfully) to shew that J[ohn] S[age]'s state of the main controversy is inconsistent with the Canons and Constitutions of the Church of Scotland, Sect. XII, XIII, XIV.

IV. He says J[ohn] S[age] is singular in his stating of it, Sect. XV.

J[ohn] S[age] not singular in it, even by Mr Forrester's acknowledgment, Sect. XVI, XVII, XVIII.

How surprizingly Mr Forrester states the main controversy, Sect. XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII.

J[ohn] S[age] not singular in his state of the main controversy by G[ilbert] R[ule]'s own acknowledgment, Sect. XXIV, XXV.

Prelatic authors generally agree with J[ohn] S[age] in his stating of the main controversy, both Scottish and English, particularly

King James the Sixth, Sect. XXVII.

Bishop Cowper, Sect. XXVIII.

Peter Hay, a gentleman of North Britain, Sect. XXIX.

Archbishop Spottiswoode, Sect. XXX.

Dr Lindesay, Bishop of Brechin, Sect. XXXI.

Dr John Forbes of Corse, Sect. XXXII.

The Doctors of Aberdeen, Sect. XXXIII.

The Bishops in their Declinature, Anno 1638, Sect. XXXIV.

Dr Maxwell, Bishop of Ross, and afterwards Archbishop of Tuam, Sect. XXXV.

King Charles the First, Sect. XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII.

Andrew Logie, Archdeacon of Aberdeen, Sect. XXXIX.

The Author of the "Seasonable Case," Anno 1662, Sect. XL.

Honyman, Bishop of Orkney, Sect. XLI.

Leighton, Bishop of Dumblane, Sect. XLII.

Gilbert Burnet, Professor of Divinity in Glasgow, Sect. XLIII.

The Author of the " Reformed Bishop," Sect. XLIV.
The Author of the " Differences of the Times," Sect. XLV.
A. C. M. A. in his Essay concerning Church Government, Sect. XLVI.
The Author of the " Ten Questions," &c., Sect. XLVII.
Doctor Monro, Sect. XLVIII.
A recapitulation, Sect. XLIX.
A transition to English authors, Sect. L.
Archbishop Whitgift, Sect. LI.
The great Hooker, Sect. LII.
Sutlivius, Sect. LIII.
Bishop Downam, Sect. LIV, LV, even by the concessions of A. Melvin and D. Calderwood ; and Mr Forrester chastised, Sect. LVI.
Bishop Bilson, even by the concessions of A. Melvin and D. Calderwood, Sect. LVII.
Bishop Morton, Sect. LVIII.
Doctor Field, Sect. LVIX.
Bishop Andrews, Sect. LX.
Bishop Davenant, Sect. LXI.
Mr Chillingworth and a great party with him, Sect. LXII.
Archbishop Usher, Sect. LXIII.
Doctor Holdsworth, Sect. LXIV.
Bishop Hall, Sect. LXV, LXVI, LXVII.
Mr Baylie's adversary, by Baylie's own confession, Sect. LXVIII.
The author of the book entituled " Velitationes Polemicæ," Sect. LXIX.
The learned Mr Thorndike, Sect. LXX.
The author of the " Brief Account of Antient Church Government," Sect. LXXI.
Dr Isaac Barrow, Sect. LXXII.
Dr Stillingfleet, Sect. LXXIII.
Dr Sherlock, Sect. LXXIV.
Dr Parker, Bishop of Oxford, Sect. LXXV.
Dr Pearson, Bishop of Chester, Sect. LXXVI.
Other twenty-four English authors, Sect. LXXVII.
Antonius de Dominis, Sect. LXXIX.
Bishop Taylor, Sect. LXXX.
Doctor Hammond, Sect. LXXXI.
Mr Dodwell, Sect. LXXXVIII, LXXXIX.
An advice to G[ilbert] R[ule] concerning Mr Dodwell, Sect. XC.
A recapitulation, Sect. XCI.
The *sole power* of ordination not allowed to Scottish Bishops by the constitution of the Church, Sect. XCIII, XCIV.
Nor the *sole* power of jurisdiction, Sect. XCV, XCVI, XCVII, XCVIII.
Neither allowed them by the practice of Scottish Government, Sect. XCIX.
Sole power not allowed to either English or Irish Bishops by the constitutions of these Churches, Sect. C, CI,
Parity or imparity, &c., the true state of the controversy, Sect. CII.
So it is stated by many Presbyterian authors, Sect. CIII,—particularly
By Mr Baylie, Sect. CIV.
By another Scottish author, Sect. CV.
By the author of the " Case of Accommodation," &c., Sect. CVI.
By Mr William Jameson, Sect. CVII.

By Mr Thomas Forrester, Sect. CVIII.
By G[ilbert] R[ule] himself, Sect. CIX, CX.
Parity and imparity must be the state of the main controversy by the tendency of the Presbyterian arguments, Sect. CXI.
And by the tendency of the Prelatic arguments, Sect. CXII, CXIII, CXIV.
And by the similes insisted on by the Prelatists, Sect. CXV.
The Chapter concluded, Sect. CXVI.

CHAPTER V.

G[ILBERT] R[ULE'S] SECOND MAIN SUBTERFUGE ATTACKED, FIRST BY PRODUCING A SPECIMEN OF THE TERMS AND PHRASES WHICH DO FREQUENTLY OCCUR IN THE MONUMENTS OF THE CYPRIANIC AGE; AND DO NECESSARILY IMPORT A MAJORITY OF POWER, AS WELL AS DIGNITY, LODGED IN THE PERSONS OF BISHOPS AS CONTRADISTINCT FROM PRESBYTERS, —P. 208–251.

The subterfuge stated, and how frequently retreated to by G[ilbert] R[ule], Sect. I, II.
Most ridiculously in the cases of Tertullian and St Austin, Sect. III.
This subterfuge briefly subverted, Sect. IV, V, VI, VII.
A more full subversion of it proposed as a supplement to the "Principles of the Cyprianic Age," Sect. VIII.
The method laid down, Sect. IX.
I. Episcopal honour, in the Cyprianic style, imports power, Sect. X.
A gross instance of G[ilbert] R[ule's] disingenuity exposed, Sect. XI, XII, XIII.
II. Episcopal dignity, in the Cyprianic style, imports power, Sect. XIV.
III. The term *consilium*, in the Cyprianic style, imports power, Sect. XV.
The true sense of the phrase [*Limare Consilium*] established, and Episcopal superiority in the person of St Cyprian demonstrated, Sect. XVI, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII.
IV. Episcopal providence, imports power, Sect. XXIV.
V. Episcopal authority, another Cyprianic term, Sect. XXV.
VI. Episcopal or sacerdotal power, Sect. XXVI.
VII. Honour and authority in conjunction, Sect. XXVII.
VIII. Honour and power in conjunction, Sect. XXVIII.
IX. Power and authority in conjunction, Sect. XXIX.
X. Many phrases importing power enumerated, Sect. XXX.
An improvement of the preceding observations, Sect. XXXI.
XI. The Episcopal *actus* explained, Sect. XXXII.
XII. Episcopal discipline considered, Sect. XXXIII.
XIII. Episcopal *vigor*, Sect. XXXIV, XXXV.

XIV. Episcopal tribunitian power, Sect. XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII.
XV. The Episcopal censorian power, Sect. XXXIX.
XVI. The Episcopal *licentia* or absolute power, Sect. XL, XLI, XLII, XLIII, XLIV.
XVII. The Episcopal *liberum arbitrium*, Sect. XLV.
An improvement, Sect. XLVI.
A transition to the next Chapter, Sect. XLVII.

CHAPTER VI.

G[ILBERT] R[ULE'S] SECOND MAIN SUBTERFUGE OVERTHROWN BY PRODUCING A SPECIMEN OF PREROGATIVES LODGED IN THE BISHOP'S PERSON IN THE DAYS OF ST CYPRIAN,—P. 252–370.

A brief introduction, Sect. I.
I. By the principles of the Cyprianic age, Bishops successors to the Apostles in the supreme power Ecclesiastical, Sect. II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII.
II. Promoted by singular succession, Sect. XIV, XV, XVI, XVII.
III. Made a College distinct from Presbyters, Sect. XVIII, XIX.
A recapitulation and the concessions of Chamier, Blondel, and Salmasius, Sect. XX, XXI.
IV. The Bishop's *locus* and *gradus*, Sect. XXII, XXIII.
V. His *cathedra* or chair, XXIV, XXV, XXVI.
Divers other prerogatives named, Sect. XXVII.
VI. The Bishop Præpositus to Presbyters, Sect. XXVIII, XXIX, XXX.
VII. He was *Gubernator* or Steersman, Sect. XXXI.
VIII. He held the balance of Government, Sect. XXXII.
IX. He was the High Priest, Sect. XXXIII, XXXIV.
The *Sacerdotii sublime fastigium*, what? Sect. XXXV.
X. He was Pastor in Chief, Sect. XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII, XXXIX, XL.
XI. He was the one Judge, Sect. XLI, XLII, XLIII, XLIV, XLV.
XII.—He was the same to his Diocese that a King is to the Kingdom, Sect. XLVI.
No absurdity in ascribing Majesty to a Bishop, Sect. XLVII, XLVIII, XLIX, L, LI.
However, more prerogatives adducible, Sect. LII; yet only one farther insisted on, namely,
XIII.—A Bishop in St Cyprian's time had the supreme power of the Sacraments. Instanced in Baptism, Sect. LIII.
Tertullian's testimony concludes it effectually, Sect. LIV.
Ignatius's testimony concludes it effectually; and G[ilbert] R[ule]'s surprizing attempt to make Ignatius a Presbyterian, Sect. LV.
St Cyprian's testimony concludes it effectually; and G[ilbert] R[ule]'s surprizing evasions exposed, Sect. LVI, LVII, LVIII, LIX, LX.
Fortunatus à Thuchabori, his testimony concludes it, Sect. LXI.
Firmilian's testimony concludes it, Sect. LXII.

The Bishop's sovereign power of Baptism follows necessarily from many of the abovementioned and asserted prerogatives, Sect. LXIII, LXIV, LXV.

Another testimony of St Cyprian's concludes it, Sect. LXVI.

The Bishop's sovereign power of Baptism inferred from the testimonies of other fourteen of St Cyprian's contemporaries, Sect. LXVII, LXVIII, LXIX, LXX.

Proved farther from this, that none but Bishops could determine controversies and cases about Baptism, Sect. LXXI.

The testimony of Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria (one of St Cyprian's contemporaries), proves it irresistibly, Sect. LXXII.

It is evident from the whole management of the grand controversy concerning heretical and schismatical baptisms, Sect. LXXIII.

The true state of that controversy, Sect. LXXIV.

The Bishop's sovereign power of Baptism supposed by both Stephanians and Cyprianists in the state of the controversy, Sect. LXXV, LXXVI, LXXVII.

It is supposed in the chief argument insisted on by the Stephanians, Sect. LXXVIII.

It is inferred from seven arguments insisted on by the Cyprianists, Sect. LXXIX, LXXX.

It is inferred from a ninth argument of theirs, viz. that the Bishop had as much the power of Baptism as of Confirmation, Sect. LXXXI.

G[ilbert] R[ule]'s vain attempt to deprive the Cyprianic Bishop of the sovereign power of Ordination, Sect. LXXXII.

A Bishop in St Cyprian's time had as much the sovereign power of Baptism as of Confirmation, Sect. LXXXIII.

G[ilbert] R[ule]'s surprizing notions about Confirmation exposed, Sect. LXXXIV, LXXXV, LXXXVI, LXXXVII.

The Cyprianic notion of Confirmation, Sect. LXXXVIII.

St Cyprian and his contemporaries held Baptism and Confirmation to be two distinct Sacraments, Sect. LXXXIX.

Depending on distinct institutions, Sect. XC.

Producing distinct operations, Sect. XCI, XCII.

Capable of contradictory predicates, the one being iterable, and the other not, Sect. XCIII.

The one so far from being an appendage of the other, that many years might have intervened between them, Sect. XCIV.

Confirmation as much designed for conferring the ordinary, as the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, Sect. XCV.

A recapitulation and transition, Sect. XCVI.

The Bishop the minister of Confirmation, Sect. XCVII.

St Cyprian's testimony acknowledged by Blondel and Daille to prove it, Sect. XCVIII, XCIX, C, CI, CII.

The Bishop's sovereign power of Baptism thence inferred, Sect. CIII.

Firmilian makes the Bishop the minister of Confirmation, Sect. CIV, CV.

So doth Cornelius, Sect. CVI, CVII.

As is acknowledged by Blondel, Salmasius, and Daille, Sect. CVIII, CIX, CX.

The same proved by other arguments, Sect. CXI.

The Bishop's sovereign power of Baptism demonstrated from one of the most remarkable results of the controversy about heretical and schismatical baptisms, Sect. CXII, CXIII.

CHAPER VII.

G[ILBERT] R[ULE]'S SECOND MAIN SUBTERFUGE FINALLY OVERTHROWN BY A REPRESENTATION OF THE BISHOP'S SOVEREIGN INTEREST IN SOME OF THE MOST EMINENT ACTS OF GOVERNMENT,—P. 371–452.

The method proposed, Sect. I, II.
By the principles of the Cyprianic age, the Bishop by himself could give laws to his Diocese, Sect. III.
This proved from divers Cyprianic principles, Sect. IV.
Proved from St Cyprian's practice, Sect. V, VI.
Proved from divers prerogatives, accounted for Chap. VI, Sect. VII.
Proved from these words, "*Quando a primordio Episcopatus*," &c. Sect. VIII, IX.
St Cyprian, &c. did ordinarily act with the consent of Presbyters, Sect. X.
But with a negative over them, Sect. XI.
The Scottish constitution agreeable to the Cyprianic principles, Sect. XII.
Bishops alone defined in Provincial Councils, Sect. XIII.
This proved by an induction of Canons, &c., Sect. XIV.
Proved more particularly from the Synodical Decrees concerning the Lapsers, Sect. XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII.
And from the constitution of the Synods convocated to determine in the grand controversy concerning heretical baptisms, Sect. XIX.
Particularly of the great Synod of Carthage, anno 256, Sect. XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII.
Objections stated, Sect. XXIV.
General answers, Sect. XXV, XXVI.
Particular answers, Sect. XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX.
Presbyters had no more power than the people in Synods, Sect. XXX, XXXI, XXXII.
The people had not definitive voices in Synods, Sect. XXXIII.
The people had not an elective voice in the promotion of Bishops, Sect. XXXIV.
Suffragium Plebis not an elective voice, Sect. XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII.
Popular elections not favoured by these words, "*Quando plebs maxime habeat potestatem eligendi dignos*," &c., Sect. XXXIX.
Arguments proving that the people had not an elective suffrage, &c., Sect. XL, XLI, XLII.
By consequence, not definitive voices in Synods, Sect. XLIII.
The people, even in the Cyprianic age, incapable of having a definitive voice in Synods, Sect. XLIV.
Whatever interest the people had, it was common to the *plebs universa*, or to all the people, Sect. XLV, XLVI, XLVII.
By consequence, the people had not definitive voices, &c., Sect. XLVIII.
The people had not definitive voices in particular Churches, Sect. XLIX.
Not in Rome, no not while the See was vacant, Sect. L, LI, LII.
Much less when filled, Sect. LIII.

Not in Carthage while Cyprian was in his retirement, Sect. LIV.
Much less while in the city, Sect. LV, LVI.
Martyrs and Confessors had peculiar prerogatives, Sect. LVII.
And were mighty zealous in the cause of the Lapsers, Sect. LVIII.
Yet could do no more but recommend or petition, Sect. LIX.
Their petitions when displeasing rejected by the Bishop, Sect. LX, LXI, LXII, LXIII, LXIV.
By consequence none of the people had definitive voices, Sect. LXV.
The real privileges of the people in Synods, Sect. LXVI, LXVII, LXVIII.
The true purpose of the phrase, *Sicut mutuus honor poscit*, Sect. LXVII.
Neither all Presbyters, nor all Deacons present in Synods, nor otherwise represented than by their Bishops, Sect. LXIX, LXX.
The result of the preceding discourse concerning the power of the people, &c., Sect. LXXI.
Canons for the Catholic Church how made, Sect. LXXII.
Of the Bishop's power of jurisdiction, Sect. LXXIII.
G[ilbert] R[ule] chastised, and the Chapter concluded with a syllogism, Sect. LXXIV, LXXV.

CHAPTER VIII.

G[ILBERT] R[ULE]'S THIRD MAIN SUBTERFUGE STATED AND DEFEATED,—P. 453–481.

It is, that there were three sorts of Presbyters in St Cyprian's time; and the services for which it is contrived, Sect. I, II, III.
It is unfixed Presbyters considered, Sect. IV, V.
It is Ruling Elders considered, Sect. VI, VII.
Blondel surprizingly cited for Ruling Elders, Sect. VIII.
Archbishop Whitgift surprizingly cited for Ruling Elders, Sect. IX.
Mr Thorndike surprizingly cited for Ruling Elders, Sect. X.
Origen in vain cited for Ruling Elders, Sect. XI.
Tertullian in vain cited for Ruling Elders, Sect. XII.
No vestige of Ruling Elders in the "Gesta Purgationis Cæciliani et Felicis," nor in Jerome, nor Austin, nor Gregorius Magnus, nor Isidorus Hispalensis, Sect. XIII, XIV, XV.
Whether St Basil and Optatus, St Cyprian's contemporaries? Sect. XVI.
St Basil surprizingly adduced for Ruling Elders, Sect. XVII.
Optatus makes nothing for Ruling Elders, Sect. XVIII, XIX.
Four arguments *ad homines*, viz. G[ilbert] R[ule] and T[homas] F[orrester] against Ruling Elders, Sect. XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV.

CHAPTER IX.

NO COUNTENANCE GIVEN BY THE PRINCIPLES OF THE CYPRIANIC AGE TO PAPACY,—P. 482–516.

An Introduction, and G[ilbert] R[ule]'s first insinuation, viz. That we lay greater stress on antiquity than the Scriptures, considered, Sect. I, II.

Every Bishop's being the principle of unity to his own Church, no plea for a Papacy, Sect. III.
Every Bishop's being High Priest, &c., inconsistent with a Papacy, Sect. IV, V.
The Papacy unavoidably excluded, by making the College of Bishops the principle of unity to the Catholic Church, Sect. VI, VII.
The Presbyterian plea, That we borrow our arguments for establishing Episcopacy from the Papist, proposed, Sect. VIII.
How much insisted on against Dr Monro by Mr Jameson, Sect. IX.
How much by G[ilbert] R[ule], Sect. X.
How much by T[homas] F[orrester] in his "Hierarchic Bishop's Claim," &c., Sect. XI.
The charge very probably false, Sect. XII, XIII.
Very certainly senseless, Sect. XIV.
Very monstrously shameless, Sect. XV, XVI.
The Presbyterian plea, That Episcopacy introduces a Papacy, proposed, Sect. XVII.
It is a Popish argument, Sect. XVIII.
Popish principles as warmly charged by other sectarians on Presbyterians, as by Presbyterians on Prelatists, Sect. XIX, XX, XXI.
The Answers returned to the charge by the Presbyterians do every way as much purge the Prelatists, Sect. XXII, XXIII.
Other answers to the charge as made against us by the Presbyterians, Sect. XXIV.
Episcopacy absolved from the scandal of being introductive of Popery, by a full jury of learned Presbyterians, Sect. XXV, XXVI.
The Papists are convinced that our principles are inconsistent with a Papacy, Sect. XXVII.
This Chapter a sufficient vindication of Dr Monro's "Inquiry into the New Opinions," &c., Sect. XXVIII.

CHAPTER X.

EPISCOPACY WAS BELIEVED BY ST CYPRIAN AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES TO BE OF DIVINE RIGHT,—P. 517–562.

The provocation given by G[ilbert] R[ule] to prove that this was a Cyprianic principle, Sect. I.
Of how great consequence it is, if it can be proved to have been a received principle in that age, Sect. II.
That it was a received principle, proved from divers things already demonstrated, Sect. III.
St Cyprian believed that Bishops were promoted by special Divine designation, Sect. IV.
He believed that they were vindicated and protected by a special Divine Providence, Sect. V.
The consequence of the two preceding considerations, Sect. VI.
He believed that God did honour Bishops with extraordinary revelations for their direction and encouragement in the administration of the Episcopal office, Sect. VII, VIII.

The consequence of this consideration, and its peculiar force against Scottish Presbyterians, Sect. IX, X, XI, XII.
He believed rebellion against, contempt of, separation from a Bishop, &c., to be transgressions of the Divine law, Sect. XIII.
He believed that the devil had a peculiar malice against Bishops as being of Divine institution, Sect. XIV.
He positively and expressly asserts the Divine institution of Episcopacy, Sect. XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI.
Origen and Dionysius believed the Divine institution of Episcopacy, Sect. XXII, XXIII.
It was universally believed by all the Bishops in Africa, Sect. XXIV, XXV, XXVI.
It was universally believed by all the Christians in Rome, Sect. XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXX.
It was believed by Alexander the Bishop, and all the Christians in Jerusalem, Sect. XXXI.
Firmilian never declared for Presbyterial Government, Sect. XXXII, XXXIII, XXXIV, XXXV.
He has declared positively for Episcopal Government, Sect. XXXVI.
He himself was a famous Bishop, superior to many Presbyters, Sect. XXXVII, XXXVIII.
He has declared plainly for Divine right of Episcopacy, Sect. XXXIX, XL.
Pontius no declarer for Presbyterial Government, Sect. XLI, XLII, XLIII.
Pontius clearly makes St Cyprian to have been first a Presbyter, and after that a Bishop, Sect. XLIV, XLV, XLVI, XLVII, XLVIII, XLIX, L, LI, LII, LIII.
Pontius believed the Divine institution of Episcopacy, Sect. LIV.
A recapitulation of the evidences of the universal reception of Episcopacy as of Divine right in the Cyprianic age, Sect. LV.
No age more zealous against innovations or recessions from Divine institutions than the Cyprianic, Sect. LVI.
Particularly in the constitution and government of Churches, Sect. LVII.
The tendency of this Work, and its conclusion, Sect. LVIII, LIX.

A

VINDICATION

OF A

DISCOURSE,

ENTITULED

THE PRINCIPLES OF THE CYPRIANIC AGE, &c.

THE PREFACE.[1]

THOUGH the Author be a Scotsman, yet the subject is English, that is Episcopacy; which is but one in all the world, "cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur,"[2] of which every Bishop holds the whole power in partnership, or in common with all the rest of his fellow Bishops of the whole Catholick Church.

Here are the dying groans of Episcopacy in Scotland, which, like Sampson, triumphs in his death, and slew more of the Philistines than in all his life, besides shaking the temple of their Dagon to pieces, and burying them, with himself, in its ruins.

If we cannot help to *restore* Episcopacy in Scotland, are we forbidden to *pity* it too?

But why do I name Scotland? Is it not our own case as much as their's? Is Episcopacy any more *jure Divino* here than it is there? Is it out of the reach of an Act of Parliament[3] to abolish it here, as has been done there?

In the reign of King Charles II., when the Archbishop of Glasgow, Dr Burnet, was thrust out by the Assertory

[1] [From the sharp watch kept over the Press by the Kirk, it was usual for writers on the Episcopal side to get their books printed and published in London. Hence this Preface seems to have been written there by some Englishman, to whom the MS. had been sent.—E.]

[2] [S. Cyp. de Unitate Ecclesiæ. Ed. Oxon. p. 108.—E.]

[3] [Episcopacy was disestablished in Scotland by an Act of an illegal Parliament, passed 19th July 1689.—E.]

Act,[1] anno 1669, the Archbishop and other Bishops of England espoused it as their own cause; nor did they

[1] [For the benefit of those who are unacquainted with the subject, I subjoin an account of the origin and consequences of this extraordinary Act. At the establishment of the Episcopal Church in 1662, the Government encountered much serious opposition from the Covenanting party. The sermons of their preachers were seditious harangues, and their conventicles, hotbeds of disloyalty and rebellion. Accordingly, the Council set about devising a scheme for ridding the country of the constant excitement caused by the MacBriars and Kettledrummles of the day. The result of their deliberations was the "Indulgence," "given at Whitehall 7th June 1669, by his Majesty's command," and bearing the signature of "Lauderdale," which is celebrated by Sir W. Scott in "Old Mortality." By this indulgence or toleration, such Presbyterian ministers as had deserted their charges, or had been deposed since 1662, were to be re-admitted to such parishes as were then vacant, on condition of their living peaceably with their Episcopal brethren, and admitting none but those of their respective parishes to attend their ministrations. This document, if it argues ill for the churchmanship of Charles' councillors, shows, at all events, their desire to preserve the peace and quiet of the country, and to deprive the Covenanters of all cause of complaint. For "it was not merely such a toleration as dissenters from the national establishment of the present day enjoy; it was much more; it permitted dissenters to enjoy the livings of the established Church, *without acknowledging her jurisdiction*, or being comprehended within her pale. It was the complete establishment of Presbytery in the heart of Episcopacy. It dispensed with the laws by which the government of Bishops was established in Scotland, and weakened the unity and constitution of Episcopacy."—Stephen's "Life and Times of Archbishop Sharp," p. 390, 391. The prelates and clergy of that day, although holding high enough notions of the regale, could not allow this exercise of it to pass without a challenge; more especially as this Act of the Council contradicted not only *ecclesiastical* but *civil* law, *i.e.* ran directly in the teeth of several Acts of Parliament, which related to the power of Bishops and the institution of ministers. The Synod of Glasgow with their Archbishop were loudest in their remonstrances, dwelling upon the illegality of the measure, and the fatal effects which it was likely to produce in the Church. Lauderdale and his co-advisers discerned the false steps which they had taken, and with statesmanlike craft determined to protect themselves. For this purpose when Parliament again met, a Bill was brought in and passed, which deprived the Church of all external authority, and made her the creature of the Sovereign's will. This Bill, because it asserted the Royal supremacy so high obtained the name of the "Assertory Act," and its main object was to be "an indemnity to the Council for enacting the Indulgence in such an arbitrary and unconstitutional way; to secure the King's Ministers from impeachment for having superseded Acts of Parliament by an Act of

leave it till they had the Archbishop restored. They considered *Proximus Ucalegon*——and when their neighbour's

Council." This wicked enactment, which is disgraceful alike both to the Monarch and Parliament who imposed it, and the ecclesiastics who submitted to it, deserves to be recorded here, as a cause of humiliation to us for the sins of our forefathers, and a source of gratitude that our Church is no longer under the yoke of such bondage to the State. It is headed "Act anent the SUPREMACY! 16th November 1669," and runs thus—"The Estates of Parliament having seriously considered how necessary it is for the good and peace of the Church and State, that his Majesty's power and authority, in relation to matters and persons ecclesiastical, be more clearly *asserted* by an Act of Parliament, have therefore thought fit it be enacted, *asserted*, and declared; likeas his Majesty, with advice and consent of his Estates of Parliament, doth hereby enact, ASSERT, and declare, that his Majesty hath the supreme authority and supremacy over all persons, and in all causes ecclesiastical, within this his kingdom; and that by virtue thereof, THE ORDERING AND DISPOSAL OF THE EXTERNAL GOVERNMENT AND POLICY OF THE CHURCH DOTH PROPERLY BELONG TO HIS MAJESTY AND HIS SUCCESSORS, AS AN INHERENT RIGHT OF THE CROWN; and that his Majesty and his successors may settle, enact, and emit such constitutions, acts, and orders, concerning the administration of the external government of the Church, and the persons employed in the same, and concerning all ecclesiastical meetings, and matters to be proponed and determined therein, as they in their royal wisdom shall think fit; which acts, orders, and constitutions being recorded in the Books of Council, and duly published, are to be observed and obeyed by all his Majesty's subjects—any law, act, or custom to the contrary notwithstanding; likeas his Majesty, with advice and consent foresaid, doth rescind and annul all laws, acts, and clauses thereof, and all customs and constitutions civil or ecclesiastic, which are contrary to, or inconsistent with his MAJESTY'S SUPREMACY, as it is hereby *asserted*, and declares the same void and null in all time coming." To the everlasting honour of Archbishop Burnet, he was so opposed to this miserable tyranny of Charles and his Council, and was so well known to be determined to uphold the spiritual power of Christ's Church, that it became necessary to hinder him from taking his place in Parliament on the shameless occasion. Upon pretence of his having rendered himself amenable to the laws, by becoming a party to the remonstrances against the Indulgence, he was ordered to confine himself to his diocese until His Majesty's pleasure should be known. During his absence the "Act" passed. Burnet was afterwards deprived of all his temporalities, and his name was expunged from the list of Privy Councillors. When he retired into private life, Leighton, the Bishop of Dunblane, was chosen to administer the affairs of the Glasgow Diocese, at first merely under the title of Commendator. He afterwards assumed the title of Archbishop, and was regarded as such in 1674, when he resigned his jurisdiction and went into England. It happened at this time that Lauderdale was impeached by the English House of Commons; and in order

house was on fire, to look to their own. Episcopacy is one College, and if any apartment, though at the utmost corner, be in flames, if no care be taken, the rest will soon share the same fate.[1]

And did the Bishops of England then shew so much zeal, so much concern and foresight, in the case of one Bishop in Scotland, and now, when not only a few, but all the Bishops in Scotland, not only all the Bishops, but Episcopacy itself, is deprived, by the name of an "unsupportable grievance,"[2] as it is branded in their Act of Abolition, and all this for no crime at all charged upon these Bishops but that of Episcopacy, for they went not out there upon the oaths, they were deprived before the new oaths were imposed there. And is there not one, no not one to be found in England that sees any danger in this, that will

to ingratiate himself with the Bishops of England, and thus defeat the impeachment, he took advantage of Leighton's resignation, and restored Burnet to his See after a deposition of six years. The Archbishop was uncle to the future Bishop of Sarum, who in the day of his power proved himself so ungrateful to his Mother Church.

[1] [The maxim here delivered is deserving of deep consideration; and if delicacy did not interfere, we would strive to impress it upon the venerable rulers of the southern Church at the present crisis. The battle of Episcopacy and Dissent is to be fought over again, and Scotland is the ground on which the conflicting parties are gathering their strength. It is in vain that the authorities in the English Church think they can witness the struggle neutral. In spite of themselves, their Church is concerned in it; our success will add to *her* strength, but our defeat and weakening will tell *fearfully* the other way. It were wisdom, (would that it were done in charity?) therefore, to strengthen the hands of our prelates, and in some manner which could not be mistaken, to issue a conjunct warning to their clergy and laity as to their duty while in Scotland. We want nothing beyond this, and surely if schism is believed by them to be what God's Word declares it is, it becomes the Bishops in England not to give any doubtful sound, but to make some vigorous efforts for pointing out to their subjects the dangers in Scotland, and for rescuing them from falling into them. Several methods suggest themselves by which this might be effected; but I have, it may be thought, already overstepped the bounds of proper respect.—E.]

[2] [*Vide* "Fundamental Charter of Presbytery," by Bishop Sage, p. 97. The Article.—E.]

open his mouth, or dare even to pray (but in private) for the restoring of Episcopacy in Scotland.

If the objection be the inclinations of the people, and that they will not have it otherwise, the Episcopal party there desire that this may be put to the test, by letting the immediate sense of the Nation be known in a free election of their representatives in Parliament, which they have not had since this Revolution. And though many and pressing instances have been made for a free election in that Country, as has been granted to England, yet can it not be obtained. The Presbyterian party have interest to render all these attempts ineffectual, well knowing, at least fearing, that a free Parliament there would shew the inclinations of the people to be far otherwise than they have represented them.

Let me tell you withal, that by the constitution in Scotland, it was impossible to have turned the Bishops there out of the Parliament without their own consent. For nothing could be offered to the Parliament but what had first passed the Lords of the Articles, and had their approbation. These Lords of the Articles consisted of such a number of the Bishops, the Lay-Lords, and Commons. The Bishops not only chose those of their own body, but of the Lay-Lords likewise; then they both chose whom they thought fit out of the Third Estate of the Commons; so that the balance of the choice of the Lords of the Articles was in the hands of the Bishops. Therefore they could never have been reached upon the foot of the Constitution. But the instructions from Copt-Hall,[1] 1689, (printed here by autho-

[1] [Copt Hall, in the Hundred of Waltham, and County of Essex, was the seat of Charles, sixth Earl of Dorset, who aided the Princess Anne in her withdrawal from London, after her husband had joined the Prince of Orange, and was a ringleader in the revolutionary movement. It seems that William took up his temporary residence at Copt Hall, and the "Instructions" referred to here were dated from thence. *Vide* Acta Parl. Scot. vol. 9, p. 98.—E.]

rity,) enabled that Convention to turn themselves into a Parliament, having first turned out the Bishops. There was no other way of coming at them, for they sat in the Convention before this, which could not otherwise have been called a meeting of the Estates (that was the name they gave to themselves), of which the Bishops were the First.

We must not say that the Church of England interest is less than theirs at Court. But it does not yet appear whether it has been tried. And if an English Convocation can sit and part without taking any notice of the case of Episcopacy in Scotland, it may be thought that they have forgot, or are unconcerned, or wait a better opportunity.

If it be said, What can they do? They know that better than I can direct them. A willing mind will find out many ways; I have no skill of addresses to Court.[1]

But this they may do, do something like what the Presbytérian preachers do now in Scotland; they pray publicly for the conversion of England from their superstition and idolatry, meaning our Episcopacy and Liturgy; and hope once more to send their Covenant for a text to us.

Would we had their zeal, or they our truth!

I will not presume to say *what* is to be done; but that *something* is to be done. If once we set about it, we will find it.

At least let the following Treatise meet with a favourable reception. It is wrote in defence of our common cause; it has dissected, and effectually and learnedly overthrown the pretences of the Presbyterians in *Scotland*, and it is the same here.

The Dissenters in England have already begun to answer the London cases[2] against them, and have published a

[1] [This is an allusion to the wellknown address to King James, in which profession and practice were so greatly at variance. *Vide* the Preface to the Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, p. 65, Note 1.—E.]

[2] [These were treatises on points of Catholic doctrine and discipline,

challenge in print to maintain that they are the true Church of England. There wants but the modish phrase, as by law established, and that they hope for (in the style of 41)[1] with the assistance of their "*good brethren*" of Scotland.[2]

Here is no inconsiderable aid come to you from thence, who, single and without arms, with ill health, few books, and less leisure, which his present hard circumstances will not allow him who stands there a confessor and champion for Episcopacy, has overcome all these difficulties by a noble Christian *zeal*, which being grafted upon a clear reasoning head, and cultivated by study and assiduous application, when he can steal a little respite in a corner from his persecutors, and so much time from his sleep as his daily employment for his bread denies to him—has routed the anti-episcopal legion which possesses his native Country, baffled and exposed them to all the shame they are capable of, and driven them into the herd of swine.

put forth by "some Divines of the City of London;" their object, as the title-page to the "Cases" informs us, being "to recover Dissenters to the communion of the Church of England." These discourses relate to several of the most interesting topics at issue between "the Church" and "Protestants of all denominations;" and when we quote as their authors, Archbishops Sharp, King, Tillotson, Tennison, Dean, Sherlock, Cave, Evans, and the great Dr Hickes, the names of these illustrious Divines and scholars will be the surest pledge of the learning and principles contained in the several tracts.—E.]

[1] [The year 1641, in which Puritanism was in its zenith, and the Church of England, as a mere Establishment, lay prostrate before her fanatical opponents.—E.]

[2] [Herein is contained a sarcastic allusion to the "Christian Union" of the English Independents and the Scotch Presbyterians. For the mutual accommodation of each other in their designs against the Church and Monarchy, they were "dear brethren" for the nonce; but when the temporal pride of Prelacy was levelled with the dust, and the nation had incurred the guilt of a Monarch's murder, the friends separated and became mortal enemies; and in the feud which ensued, the Presbyterians had the worst of it, and had to endure more indignities from Cromwell than they ever received at the hands of any prelatical and lawful Prince. —E.]

There is a noble benefaction to Baliol College in Oxford for *propagating Episcopacy in Scotland*.[1] Here is an

[1] [This benefaction was left by the will of Mr John Snell of Uffeton, in the county of Warwick, executed September 13, 1679. It provides "for the maintenance and education, in some College or Hall in that University to be appointed by the Vice-Chancellor, Provost, Master, and President, for the time being, or any three of them, and in such proportions, and with such allowances, and in such manner as they, or any three of them, shall elect, think fit of, and appoint, such and so many scholars, *born and educated in Scotland*, who shall each of them have spent *three years, or two at the least, at the College of Glasgow in that Kingdom, or one year there, and two at the least in some other College in that Kingdom*, as they, the said Vice-Chancellor, or Provost, Master, and President, for the time being, or any three of them, shall think fit." It further provides, "*that every such scholar or scholars*, upon each of their admission to such College or Hall as aforesaid, shall be *bound and obliged*, by such security as the said Vice-Chancellor, Provost, Master, and President, for the time being, or any three of them, shall think fit, to some person or persons to be by them, or any three of them, thereunto appointed, that the said *scholar or scholars shall respectively forfeit and pay to that College or Hall* whereof or wherein he or they shall be respectively admitted, *the sum of L.500 a-piece if he shall not enter into holy orders*, or if he or they shall, *at any time after his or their entering and admission, take or accept of any spiritual promotion, benefice, or other preferment whatsoever, within the Kingdom of England or Dominion of Wales;* it being my will and desire that every scholar so to be admitted *shall return into Scotland*, and there to be advanced as his or their capacity and parts shall deserve, *but in no case to come back into England, nor to go into any other place, but only into the Kingdom of Scotland*, for his or their preferment. And my will also is, that none of the scholars to be elected and admitted as aforesaid, shall take any benefit of this my bequest above the space of ten years, or eleven at the most; for after that time they are, and it is my express will and desire that they shall and may be, *removed into Scotland, as aforesaid*." It provides also, that the scholars shall be elected by the Principal and certain of the Professors of the University of Glasgow, subject to the *approval of the Oxford Trustees*. Nothing can be plainer than the intention of the testator, who is said to have been a sort of travelling merchant in Scotland. In the pursuit of his vocation he had witnessed the struggles of Episcopacy with the fanaticism of the Covenanters and their descendants, the Hillmen and Field Preachers. He was most probably not blind to the defects in the Church of that day, which was without a Liturgy, was paralyzed by Erastianism, and assumed no higher tone on matters of Church Polity, than was put forth in the theology of a Leighton and Cowpar, who, though eminently holy, had not sound ideas of that visible unity and sameness which is the divinely marked character of the Catholic Church of Christ, and the worthy man perhaps hoped that the infusion of some sounder

opportunity offered towards that end. If not to aid and

Church principle, mingled with Oxford learning, might produce good effects in Scotland. However this may be, he bequeathed his money with a destination distinct enough. But the law, which professes to be impartial and jealous of testamentary arrangements, proved otherwise in this case. Though the expressions in the will are clear as light, and as we see in this preface it was at the time distinctly understood that the "Benefaction to Baliol College, Oxford," was "for propagating Episcopacy in Scotland," the triumphant cause of Presbytery could blind the eyes of the law, and the Presbyterian Professors of Glasgow College did not hesitate to thwart the intentions of the zealous and liberal donor. Of the misapplication of the Snell Exhibitions we have a long catalogue in "The History of the Scottish Episcopal Church since the Revolution," p. 458-9, by John Parker Lawson, who affirms that *Scotch Judges* and *Advocates*, members of the Presbyterian Church, and even *Kirk Ministers*, have availed themselves of this convenient way of graduating at an English University. We can add from our own knowledge, that at a recent competition for an exhibition, the son of either a Baptist or Independent minister was elected by the Glasgow Senatus in preference to the son of an Episcopal Clergyman, notwithstanding the latter had distinguished himself quite as much as his rival had done, and was devoted to Holy Orders. Abuses of this sort were too flagrant to escape notice; but like many others, which are not of private concern, they might have continued long uncorrected, had not some disinterested and influential persons taken the trouble to enquire into them. Happily for the Scottish Episcopal Church she had such among her members. The Honourable Lord Medwyn, with that zealous love for our Church for which the family of Forbes has so long been conspicuous, and James Hope, Esq. undertook the task of investigation, for which their high legal attainments so eminently qualified them, and having discovered that the course pursued by the Glasgow Professors was untenable in a Court of Equity, his Lordship and Mr Hope instituted those proceedings in England which have just had so favourable a termination. We quote from the Newspaper report of the decision of Vice-Chancellor Bruce in "*Re* Attorney-General *v.* Glasgow College," July 25, 1846. His Honour said that the object of the information was to cause a charity, founded by the will of a testator, dated 1677, to be made auxiliary or advantageous to a church or religious communion, which the Legislature had, by a statute of 32d Geo. III. c. 63, designated as the "Episcopal Communion in Scotland," and by a statute of the 3d and 4th Vict. cap. 63, designated as "Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland;" a church or communion which must be taken to be established in Scotland, and to exist there consistently with the law. The information sought to have the charity administered for this purpose, which it now was not. The proposed change was opposed by the Principal, Professors, and officers of Glasgow College, who however did not consider the change as contrary to the law of England or Scotland, but as at variance with the will of the testator, and opposed to a decree made in 1759 by the Lord Keeper. His Honour would consider the former point first.

assist this author, and protect him from the *violence* of his

The testator had been born in Scotland, and had received part of his education in Scotland. When he made his will he was probably domiciled in England. The will was in the English form, and wholly in his handwriting. It must be borne in mind that when he made and altered his will, and when he died, the established religion in Scotland was Episcopal as well as Protestant, the established religion in England was Episcopal as well as Protestant, and the University of Oxford was Episcopal as well as Protestant. The University or College of Glasgow was circumstanced as follows :—(His Honour here read a passage from the answer of the College, stating that, at that time, the Colleges at Glasgow and other places in Scotland were, by the laws of that realm, placed in immediate connection with the Episcopal Church, and acknowledged the doctrines and authority thereof.) Considering these circumstances, as well as the tenor of the will, his Honour thought it reasonable and right to infer that the testator was a religiously disposed person, and when he made and republished his will, an Episcopal Protestant in connection with one of the Established Churches ; a conclusion well consistent with the present of books that he afterwards made to Glasgow College, and with the letter that he wrote on that occasion, and with the fact that he might have been born a Presbyterian. Had his Honour therefore agreed with the construction that had been put by Lord Hardwicke on the words " holy orders," and was of opinion that those words in the present will meant orders by Episcopal ordination. Proceeding upon this basis his Honour was satisfied upon the will, that the principal object of the testator was the supporting or strengthening a Church at once Protestant and Episcopal, in Scotland, and that in doctrine and ecclesiastical government he had in view either the Established Church in England at the time, or the Established Church in Scotland at the time, which two Churches, whatever differences might exist between them in some points of discipline, did not, his Honour apprehended, differ in doctrine. The proposed manner of executing this design appeared to have been the providing for Scotland a continual succession of clergymen, who, being natives of Scotland, and having received part of their education at Glasgow, should complete their education at Oxford. For the completion of this design the testator did not probably make full provision by his will. Perhaps it was not altogether adapted to the changes that afterwards took place in the religious establishments of the country, to say nothing of the difficulties in the direction that he gave as to the execution of a bond compelling the party to enter holy orders, and to return to Scotland. That direction, however, was not surprising. It was plain that to expect a young man to devote himself to the religion of the state—a religion well endowed with ample preferment—was a different thing from expecting him to pass his life in the country from which he came, in a communion which might become a mere tolerated body of dissenters, without anything analogous to promotion or preferment. But though the religion of Scotland was afterwards in fact changed, it did not therefore follow that this charity was changed in its objects, or was to be appropriated to the uses of the establishment for the time being.

enemies, for he fears not their *learning*, yet at least to

However strict were the regulations and conditions imposed, after the Revolution, upon members of the Episcopal Church in Scotland in respect of attending divine service, and otherwise as regarded forms or discipline, that Church did not appear to have had toleration refused to it at any time after the death of King Charles II. His Honour here read several passages from the answer of Glasgow College, in which they spoke of the Episcopal Church, "in nowise recognised or acknowleged by law," and of the Bishops "taking to themselves the title of Bishop," and of the Clergy "calling themselves Clergy." His Honour thought that there was some apology for a body of men calling themselves what the legislature had called them. That the Bishops were entitled to take to themselves that title, was clear from the late statute. There was a great difference between a person calling himself the Bishop of a particular Diocese or See, and merely giving himself the title arising from his calling or condition in life. Every one knew that a Bishop was an overseer. Such an officer might not be authorised to oversee the presbyterians in Scotland, but he might properly and legally oversee his own flock, though his title of Bishop might not be founded on civil power, worldly provision, or territorial authority. After his consecration he was stamped and endowed with a capacity of a particular order, and to deny him his title would be a discourtesy as manifest and gross as to deny to a Bishop of the Church of Rome his title of Bishop, or to refuse to a presbyterian Clergyman his designation of "Reverend." To return, however, to the question in the cause, his Honour agreed that the presbyterian religion, as the established religion of Scotland, might have affected the Episcopal Church as to worldly advantages and internal government, so as to render it impracticable to follow closely the testator's will. He was of opinion, therefore, that it was the part of English Courts of Equity to interfere, and in doing so, to endeavour, as far as possible, to adhere to the principal object that the testator had in view. The necessity of interference by an English Court of Equity, after the restoration of Presbyterianism in Scotland, had been asserted and admitted in this cause. Whether or not, before the restoration of Presbyterianism under King William III. it was in fact practicable to adhere to the will of the testator, it had not been considered practicable to do so, and perhaps some deflection from it could not be reasonably avoided. But to withdraw from the charity the fund provided for it by the testator, except under circumstances of absolute necessity, could not be justifiable. One chief contention on the part of Glasgow College had been, that the main object of the testator was general education; not that Scotchmen partly educated at Glasgow, should go to Oxford and be educated for the Church of Scotland, but that Scotchmen partly educated at Glasgow should go to Oxford and pass their time, whether as laymen or as clergymen, as idle or employed, in Scotland or elsewhere. That argument was at variance both with the spirit and the letter of the will. But it had been said that the testator did not intend to promote any particular religion; or, in other

shew some countenance to him, in receiving of his Book no otherwise than as it deserves.

words, that he intended to promote only such religion as from time to time should be the established religion of the country. To ascribe such a state of opinion to any Christian Scotchman at the end of the 17th century, might not be reproachful or absurd, but the circumstances on which such a conclusion could be founded were in so high a degree improbable, that in order to arrive at it there must be the clearest evidence; but in this case the conclusion was not supported by any evidence. On such a ground as this, a religion based on the denial of the divinity of our Saviour might be adopted as the religion intended to be promoted by the testator. If his Honour were asked whether he thought that the difference between Episcopacy and Presbyterianism was immaterial in the mind of the testator, he must answer in the negative. Upon the whole, his Honour was of opinion that the testator had especial reference to the Episcopal Church of Scotland, and that for the purposes of this cause he ought to consider the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland as it now is, as identical with the Protestant Episcopal Church of Scotland as it was in 1677 and 1679, subject, of course, to the obvious and appreciable differences between establishment and dissent.

"His Honour then proceeded to comment on the decree of 1759, and other subsequent decrees, and said that there was reason to believe that the scheme which had been founded on them operated in practice slightly, if at all, in favour of the Episcopal Church in Scotland, and that by the course of events, such a change had taken place as to render it proper to inquire whether an alteration could not be introduced that might be beneficial to the Episcopal Church in Scotland. His Honour concluded by directing a reference to the Master, to inquire whether, consistently with the law of Scotland, the scheme according to which, under the decree or decretal order of 1759, and the orders of 1777 and 1810, the charity founded by the testator was administered, could be modified or varied, so as to make such charity more effectually conducive to the supply of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Scotland with fit and competent clergymen, who, being born in Scotland and educated at Glasgow and Oxford, should exercise clerical functions in Scotland; and the Master was to approve of a scheme for administering the charity accordingly; and in proceeding to approve such scheme, the Master was to have regard to the said will, and to the circumstance, that the Established Church of Scotland was in the years 1677 and 1679 Episcopal, and is now Presbyterian; and the Master was to proceed upon the basis of the present existing scheme, and not to depart therefrom to any unnecessary extent; and he was not to disturb any exhibitioner who before and at the date of his report should be an exhibitioner of the charity; and the Master to be at liberty to state any circumstances specially; and for the present, the charity was to be administered according to the three decrees or decretal orders before mentioned—the Court, however, declaring its opinions to be, that the

principal, professors, and masters of Glasgow College, in so administering the charity, ought to have regard to the circumstance, that the testator at the date of his will was to be considered as being a member of the then Established Church of England or Scotland, and therefore (if of the Church of Scotland) of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, and as having, by the term 'holy orders,' meant holy orders by Episcopal ordination."

As these Exhibitions are so important, this extract from a Parliamentary Report, made within the last ten years, will interest the reader—"The income of Mr Snell's Charity established in Baliol College, Oxford, in 1693, for natives of Scotland, *attached by education and principles to the doctrine and discipline* of the Church of England, arises from the rent of a manor and estate at Uffeton in the county of Warwick. This property was let in 1809, upon a lease of twenty-one years, at an annual rent of L.1500, out of which the following payments were by order of the Court of Chancery appointed to be made, viz.—To ten Exhibitioners, at L.133, 6s. 8d. per annum each, L.1333, 6s. 8d.; the Master of Baliol, for gubernation money, L.31, 15s.; the College, L.63, 10s.; ditto, for an entertainment of the meeting of the Trustees to audit the accounts, L.11, 2s. 2d.; the steward or receiver of the rents, L.33, 6s. 8d.; the surplus-fund, for expenses in visiting and inspecting the estates, and if not so applied, to be vested in the public funds in the name of the accountant-general for the benefit of the estates, L.26, 19s. 6d.—in all L.1500." It will be seen from the above extract that the annual amount of the Snell Bursary to each scholar is L.133, 6s. 8d. But in addition to this, four out of the ten scholars have L.20 per annum from another source. John Warner, Bishop of Rochester, the founder of Bromley College, bequeathed L.80 per annum, arising from the manor of Swayton in Lincolnshire, for the support of four Scotchmen at Oxford. He made the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Rochester, *ex officio* patrons of the Exhibition, and stipulated that each of his Exhibitioners was to have L.20 per annum till he took the degree of Master of Arts; and afterwards was to enter into holy orders, and return to Scotland, in order that the witness of a Church protesting against the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome on the one hand, and the fiction of the Gevevan platform on the other, should not fail there. Alas! we fear that the pious intention of the worthy Prelate has been thwarted, much in the same way as the liberality of Snell has been abused. But we now hope for better things. Before concluding this Note, we must remark upon the pleadings of the Principal and Professors of Glasgow College, that the "Bishops and Clergy" of the Episcopal Church, who have hitherto, in all merely political matters, and others not involving their own special principle, supported the Established Kirk, did not expect such insult at their hands.—E.]

A VINDICATION OF A DISCOURSE

ENTITULED

THE PRINCIPLES OF THE CYPRIANIC AGE, &c.

CHAPTER I.

THE OCCASION AND REASONS OF COLLECTING THESE PRINCIPLES.

SECT. I. SOME years ago some sheets of mine had the luck to be published under the title of "The Principles of the Cyprianic Age, with regard to Episcopal Power and Jurisdiction." Some months thereafter they had an answer bearing the name of the "Cyprianic Bishop Examined, and found not to be a Diocesan, written by Gilbert Rule, one of the Ministers of the City (as he calls himself) and Principal of the College of Edinburgh." Much about the time of the publication of this book, my circumstances turned to be such as did not allow me, till very lately, to consider it seriously. And now that I am to defend those principles, I hold it not improper in the first place to account for my collecting of them, and that for two reasons. One is, that as I have been told, some who did not condemn my book did however wish that I had not began it so abruptly, but had ushered in the controversy managed in it with some preface, giving an account of the occasion and reasons of writing it. The other, that G[ilbert] R[ule] may know that however his rashness might have been the first, yet it was neither the

only nor the chief incitement that moved me to write it. The occasion was this.

II.—The Scottish Episcopal Clergy, as all Britain knows, had met with some rigours (to give them no harder names) in the beginning of the late Revolution. Some of them therefore thinking it fit to let it be known that they were not altogether insensible of those usages, had published some short accounts of them. Hence a paper war was commenced, and G[ilbert] R[ule] was employed by a general assembly of his brethren to be their champion, and to try if he could (if not justify the methods of his party, yet at least) extenuate and soften the noises which had been rais'd against them. Hereupon he published his "Second Vindication of the Church of Scotland." Shortly after that there appeared an "Apology for the Clergy of Scotland," wherein G[ilbert] R[ule] was not more roundly, than justly chastised.

III.—G[ilbert] R[ule] has all along been a man of such metal as cannot well bear with the humblest contradiction, much less with any thing that looks like daring of him, wherefore he did again gird on his armour, and in one continued huff wrote a "Defence of the Vindication of the Church of Scotland" in answer to the aforesaid Apology. I had seen all the former papers, and my curiosity likewise led me to read this last, in which, as I expected, so I found divers things apt enough to have surprised such as were unacquainted with his way of writing. But for my own part I was not much moved till I came to page 34, sect. 39, where I found him stoutly denying that there was any such thing as Episcopal Government in St Cyprian's time, and not only denying it, but fairly pledging his word that he would own himself and all his brethren to be schismatics, if it should be proved that in that age there was such a government. This, I do confess, did so take with me that I could not but think G[ilbert] R[ule] deserved to be taken at his word. And what matter if I (who then had little other business) should for some time employ myself that way, for my own private divertisement? This was indeed the first spring of the attempt I made. However,

IV.—Being fully satisfied that it was rashness in G[ilbert] R[ule] so to have exposed himself, I thought it

might be no less, if not more culpable in me to chastise his with equal rashness. I considered, therefore, if it would be worth my pains and the while to enter the lists with him; and the only thing that occurred to me on the dissuading side, was much that same series of thoughts which G[ilbert] R[ule] has published as his main argument of the unreasonableness of my attempting to expose him, viz. that granting I should defeat him in that point, yet "it would not ruin the cause of Presbyterians: it would amount to no more than that one presbyterian did mistake in a matter of fact, as it is related in the ancient history."[1] The Presbyterian cause did not depend on his credit; though he should be baffled in the scuffle, yet his brethren had all their other pleas safe and sound enough; and though he should be fairly concluded a schismatic from his own voluntary paction, yet his paction, however expressed, and however including his brethren, as much as he was able to include them, would not be sustained by his brethren to be of any more than personal and private obligation. But this reasoning did not give me much trouble; for granting it to be true that G[ilbert] R[ule] was the only man who indeed could be concluded, and that his brethren, not being accessary to his rashness, could not be affected by its consequences, yet he was a man of so great note, had made such a figure by his writings, and had so many eyes upon him, that it could not but be some service done to that, which I do still think, a good cause, to quell the pride, and thereby, perhaps, soften the temper, if not open the eyes, of one of its so famous adversaries.

V.—Neither can I think that G[ilbert] R[ule] himself, when in cold blood, can deem it unreasonable to endeavour to expose the weakness or the rashness of a bitter advocate, when he is persuaded that that advocate is pleading a very bad cause. He cannot be so unconscientious as still to have thought this unreasonable, and yet withal to have written so many books against particular adversaries. But if to do so be allowable, allowable by G[ilbert] R[ule]'s own practice, by his practice so probably regulated by an unreluctant conscience, then, methinks, he might, without in-

[1] Cyprianic Bishop Examined, p. 2, sect. 2.

justice to either his reputation or his book, have very well spared to tell his readers[1]—"That if my book was written only to convince the world that he who wrote the Defence of the Vindication against the apologist, is not infallible in all that he asserteth, I might have spared my pains; that should easily have been yielded to me." Neither can I imagine what a jumble of thoughts has been in his head when this started out. Does he fancy that all the authors he has written against did still look on themselves as infallible? For my part, as I never doubted of G[ilbert] R[ule's] fallibility, so I do assure him it was not the discovery of that, but of his rashness that I aimed at. But this is not all.

VI.—As what I have said made it seem to me not unreasonable to take him, though considered only as a private advocate, at such a disadvantage, so I considered farther that he was not to be looked on as only a private, but rather as one, if not the only public, stated, authorized advocate of the party. He himself has told us somewhere,[2] that he wrote his Second Vindication by public order. So long therefore as his commission was not revoked, (which certainly it was not when he wrote his Defence), it was reasonable to think he had the same authority for defending, which he had at first for writing that Vindication: and if so, it is plain I had very good reason to look on him as representing the whole party: but if there was reason for this, it seems farther plain that G[ilbert] R[ule] did neither great honour, nor great justice to the character of an authorized Vindicator, when he said,[3] "that granting all I pleaded for, it would amount to no more than that one Presbyterian, and he amongst the meanest of them, did mistake in a matter of fact," &c. For however this might have done with another person, yet it seems not so well to become a proclaimed champion. But to leave this.

VII.—Had it not been for other and weightier reasons than those already mentioned, it is like neither he nor any other body had ever been troubled with my book. Indeed it was not G[ilbert] R[ule] considered as other [either?] private or public advocate, but the following considerations which finally determined me to make such an attempt; particularly,

[1] P. 2, sect. 2. [2] Pref. to 2d Vind. [3] P. 2, sect. 2.

VIII.—1. Long before I saw his Defence of his Second Vindication, I had observed that the advocates for presbytery, especially in their ventilations of that truly unanswerable argument, taken from the constitution and practice of the government of the Churches of the first ages, had invented divers such subterfuges as were apt enough to cheat less knowing and less thinking people; for instance, how ordinary is it with them in their books to put off the plainest testimonies[1] of the ancientest fathers, with these or the like shifts, that they infer only a priority of *dignity*, but not at all of *power*? Or, they make only for a pre-eminence of *order*, not of *degree*? Or, they conclude no more than that he, who in those times was called Bishop, was only the first presbyter, or at most, the constant moderator of a Presbytery? And when none of these distinctions are well applicable, the last refuge is, such testimonies do not conclude that he had the sole power of ordination and jurisdiction. This, I say, is the last refuge; and so much cunning is easy, as to speak it out confidently, and with such an air as may oblige the unwary disciple to

[1] [To those who are anxious to see what *are* the arguments which the defenders of Presbytery adduce in support of their system, I would recommend a "Manual of Presbytery," by Samuel Miller, D.D. with an Appendix by the Rev. John G. Lorimer, Minister of St David's Parish, Glasgow, Edinburgh 1842. This book, within a small compass, contains as much perversion of history, and as many unfair inferences from the words of authors, as it has been my lot to meet with in the course of my reading. Believing the divines whose names are attached to this publication to be really impressed with the truth of their statements, the book forms about as clear a proof of the darkening power of prejudice over the human mind as is possible to be conceived. It is a great pity that modern Presbyterians put themselves to the trouble of controversy. The "worthies" of the Kirk said and wrote all that can be said or written in favour of the Calvinistic model, and in opposition to the constitution of the Catholic Church, and every argument and assertion of theirs has been over and over again refuted. All attempts of late have merely been *repetitions*, without the quaintness of their predecessors' writings, and really until some genius strike out a new line of attack on us, and defence of themselves, (as Mr Newman has done on the other extreme), or until the works of some long lost ecclesiastical writer of the early ages, who favours their side, are discovered, it would be better if they would abstain from controversy on the point of Church Government. For it is most annoying to persons interested in such matters to see a book advertised, to have their hopes excited, and after all to find nothing *new*, nothing but what has been better said before.—E.]

take it for granted that sole power and superiority, or, (as others call it), majority of power, are but different names for the same thing.

IX.—To adduce citations to prove that this is their way, is perfectly needless, you cannot read any of their books but you shall find instances in great plenty. And with such evasions as these, they can readily pretend that they have very well reconciled their new model of government with the form of the ancient Churches, which really is to them a matter of no small consequence. For however the more incautious among them may clamour on all occasions that they do not value the Fathers—that the Scripture is the only judge of controversies—and that they are not to be concluded by later than Scripture antiquity, &c., yet the more judicious, unless in great straits, are very loath to give an open defiance to the Primitive Church. "They are not willing," as G[ilbert] R[ule] himself tells us, "to yield that the suffrage of later than apostolic antiquity is for their adversaries." Besides this I considered—

X.—2. That as our Scottish Presbyterians are generally fonder of such books as are written on this controversy by Scottishmen of their own side than those that are written by strangers—the former being commonly more keen and peremptory for the divine institution of Parity and the unlawfulness of Prelacy than the latter—so I had observed that our Scottish Presbyterian authors had almost unanimously agreed to represent Episcopal government as an innovation, not known to the Churches, at least, of the first three centuries. It may, indeed, seem incredible to men of sense, especially such as are skilled in antiquity, that men who make such mighty pretences to truth and ingenuity—who pretend to be so zealous maintainers of the cause of Christ, and so irreconcileable enemies to all false accounts of things, and all groundless impositions on God's people—should so boldly attempt to impose a piece of such notoriously false history on their disciples: and therefore I must beg the reader's patience till I have proved that I am not injurious to them in this matter. I shall bring my proofs faithfully from their printed books. And,

XI.—1. We have a parcel of propositions set down

in Calderwood's History[1] of Mr Andrew Melvin's approbation, if not his contrivance, as seems to appear from the series of the history, amongst which propositions these are to the present purpose:—"That in the Council of Nice, for eschewing of private ordaining of ministers, it was statuted, That no pastor should be appointed without the consent of him who remained in the chief and principal city of the province—That afterwards, in the latter Councils it was statuted, that the laying on of hands upon pastors, after lawful elections, should be by the Metropolitan or Bishop of the chief and principal town, the rest of the Bishops of the province voting thereto. That the state of the Church being corrupt, the name of *Bishop*, which before was common to the rest of the pastors of the province, began *then*, (*i. e.* long after the Council of Nice, as appears from the series of the propositions), without the authority of God's Word, and ancient custom of the Kirk, to be attributed to one. And that the power of appointing and ordaining ministers and ruling of kirks, with the whole procuration of ecclesiastical discipline, was now devolved to one Metropolitan only, the other Pastors noways challenging their right and privilege therein, of very slothfulness on the one part, and the devil on the other part, going about craftily to lay the ground of Papistical supremacy." Here you see it was after the Council of Nice, (*i. e.* after the year 325, nay some good time after it), that there was any such thing as proper Prelacy; nay even that the name Bishop, which before was common to the rest of the pastors (that is the presbyters or parish ministers, in the modern Presbyterian sense), began to be attributed to one. I say the parish ministers, &c., for that such are meant is evident from those same propositions; it being expressly said in one of them—"That the ordaining and appointing of pastors, which is also called the laying on of hands, appertaineth not to one Bishop only, but to those who are of the same province or *presbytery*, and with the like jurisdiction and authority, ministers at their kirks." In short, it is plain from the whole scheme of those propositions, that they were contrived for justifying the Presbyterian model.

XII.—2. The author of the "Course of Conformity" en-

[1] P. 94.

grosses a pamphlet in his book, which pamphlet seems to have been written anno 1606; and the purpose of the third Chapter of it is to prove, "That such a Bishopry," as he calls it, "is against the doctrine of the Fathers and Doctors of the Kirk, ancient and modern." And in that Chapter I read thus—"Leaving Greg. Nazianz, Basil, and Epiphanius of the Greek, and Hieronymus, with Augustine, chief of the Latines, I will conclude with Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome, who *at the first entry of the Hierarchy* in the Kirk of the tyranny of the Antichrist, terms John of Constantinople his forerunner," &c. So that if we may believe this author, the Hierarchy had its first entry into the Kirk only in Gregory's time, *i. e.* not till about the beginning of the seventh century.

XIII.—3. Mr Calderwood, in his "Altare Damascenum," not only tells us, "that he that was called Bishop in St Cyprian's time had no negative voice in the Ecclesiastical Senate, but also that (during the first three centuries)[1] Churches were equal and their presbyters equal; that before the division of titles or parishes, they were all equal in honour and power; that if any such thing as Prelacy had obtained in the Church, either in the second or the third centuries, to use the gentlest expression, it had been the effect of imprudence, and a violation of the Divine ordinance or order, which was justly restored, after so many centuries, in the Reformed Churches."——"But I deny," says he, "that any such thing had got footing in those first ages, *i. e.* in the second and third centuries."[2]

XIV.—It were easy to bring more testimonies from him to this purpose. And perhaps it has been upon this account that he treats St Jerome so irreverently for saying, that "at Alexandria, ever since the days of St Mark, the Presbyters choosed one whom they placed in an higher station, and called him Bishop," &c.; for when he comes to consider that saying of Jerome,[3] he says, that "that

[1] P. 265.

[2] Certe si tale institutum obtinuisset in ecclesiis sive secunda annorum centuria sive tertia imprudenter, ne quid gravius dicam, violatum ordinem divinum dicerem et post tot. annorum centurias rursus in ecclesiis reformatis jure restitutum; in aliis summa cum ecclesiarum injuria non instauratum. Sed negamus id factum esse primis illis seculis. Alt. Dam. p. 287.

[3] Alt. Dam. p. 125, 126.

Father has stuffed his writings with gross errors in chronology and palpable contradictions." Perhaps it has been likewise for the same reason that on all occasions he rejects Jerome's book about ecclesiastical writers as spurious.[1] But whatever be of those things, it is evident from what I have cited, that he allows not any proper Episcopacy to have obtained during the first three centuries.

XV.—4. Lighton[2] in his famous book entitled, "Zion's Plea against Prelacy," tells us, that "this ordinance of God, (*i. e.* Presbyterian government) and practice apostolical, continued—for the space of 300 years and upward."[3] "That till the time of Pope Sylvester, about the year 320, Rome itself was without any lordship at all, upon which lordship followed that blasphemous Arianism, which afterwards made all the Churches of God to groan under it."[4] Nay, farther, that "till the year 607 every particular Church was governed by the Bishops, (*i. e.* Presbyters), Elders, and Deacons of the same; and although some years before this were titular Bishops, yet their superiority the Church would not bear."[5]

XVI.—5. The author of the Defence of the unlawfulness and danger of limited Prelacy,[6] &c., printed 1641, affirms that Episcopacy (even the most moderate) "is a plant which God never set in his garden;" and that it was "a mere stranger to the ancient Church for some hundreds of years."[7] Nay believe him, and Episcopacy was not the parent, (as his brethren commonly give out), but the child of the Papacy. "It was ever a stranger to the Church till the Pope had usurped, mainly by the help of his Episcopal jurisdiction, many antichristian privileges."[8] And "we shall be glad" (says he to his adversary) "to see your affirmation proved, namely, that ever there was in the Church of God any such Bishops (*i. e.* Bishops who pretended to a *chief* only, and not to a *sole* power, for his adversary, as himself confesses, pleaded only for such Bishops) before the Pope had brought

[1] P. 140, 141, 142, 252, 259.

[2] [The father of the Archbishop of Glasgow, who underwent an inhuman legal punishment for his seditious and infamous publications.—E.]

[3] P. 88. [4] P. 149. [5] P. 25.

[6] [Principal Baillie of Glasgow College, whose curious letters have lately been published under the superintendence of David Laing, Esq.—E.]

[7] P. 14. [8] P. 14.

his Bishopric to the cope-stone of antichristianism."[1] Once more, "when it comes to the exactest search, it will appear that Episcopacy was at most but an human ecclesiastical constitution, not received upon any better grounds than the primacy of the Patriarch of Rome, than the manifold fraternities of Monks, Friars, and Nuns, &c."[2] What sense is in these citations, how they agree with the common pretence about the mystery of Iniquity, &c., and whether they employ manifest contradictions, is not my present business to determine. It is enough for that to take notice of one effort more of this author's skilful zeal. "In Episcopal government (says he)[3] you differ little less from the ancient Kirk than from the Reformed; for the ancient Presbytery is a stranger to your land, (*i. e.* England); and your Episcopacy would be as great a stranger in any Christian Kirk, for the first five hundred years, as the Duke of Muscovia[4] would be this day in Venice, or the Empire of Tiberius in Rome in the days of Cato the elder."

XVII.—6. I have seen another pamphlet, printed that same year, entitled, "Certain Reasons tending to prove the unlawfulness and unexpediency of all Diocesan Episcopacy, even the most moderate." And the author of it tells us—"that the first mention we find of Bishops, as distinct from Presbyters, is not till about 200 years after Christ, which also," says he, "some of the Bishops' own party do not deny."[5] I cannot forbear to say, that those of the Bishops' party who did not deny this, have been pretty yielding, or this author has been pretty confident. But to go on.

XVIII.—Mr Rutherford[6] in his "Peaceable and Tem-

[1] P. 25. [2] P. 26. [3] P. 30.

[4] [This simile is also used by Leighton in Sion's Plea.—E.]

[5] P. 9, sect. 5.

[6] [Mr "Samuel," born at Crailing, near Jedburgh, and well known as the "Flower of the Kirk," is estimated by the Presbyterians as one of their most distinguished men. In that gift which is most regarded by the Scotch people, viz. preaching, he excelled. Wherever he went, he was a popular preacher; and if we may believe Wodrow, his fame for eloquence and sanctity induced the eminent Primate Usher to pay him a visit at his manse of Anworth in Galloway.—Wodrow Anal. vol. iii. p. 132-3. The "Letters" of Rutherford are a singular mixture, and bear evident marks of an ill-regulated mind. Swift—who was far from being over particular himself—has very unceremoniously characterised them.—E.]

perate Plea for Paul's Presbytery,"[1] affirms—"that if we believe antiquity, Ignatius, who was very ancient, describeth our very (Scottish) Presbytery, and calleth it a senate of pastors and elders, that was in the Church in his time. See Origen, who (says Mr Samuel) lived with Tertullian, resembleth the Presbyter to a senate of a city, and Ruffinus agreeth with them. Cyprian saith, the Presbyters and other officers have the power of the keys; so the Nicene Council," &c. Here not only Presbytery in St Cyprian's age, &c. the ages before him, but even in Ruffinus his time, who flourished not till about the end of the fourth century.

XIX.—8. Mr Petrie in his "Compendious History of the Catholic Church," &c. tom. i. not only affirms—"that all men do consent that in the time of the Apostles there was no difference between Bishops and Presbyters,"[2] which is bold enough; but he affirms farther, "that Bishops, in St Cyprian's time, were no other than pastors of particular congregations:"[3] and, "That it may be thought of some questions much stood upon now, that had they been asked of Cyprian, he had answered, '*I know not;*' as what difference between the ordination of a minister and the consecration of a Bishop?"[4] Nay, "that even in Austin's time, Bishops were only so many pastors of several congregations:"[5] "that, in Jerome's time, a Bishop was only a moderator."[6] And indeed I must confess this is every whit as true as what he has in that same page, viz.—"that Heraclas and Dionysius, Bishops of Alexandria, were Jerome's contemporaries." But to proceed, this learned author has found no fewer than four National Churches, viz.—"The African, the British, the Scottish, and the Irish, all of them governed without Prelates, some for the space of five hundred, and some for the space of one thousand or one thousand one hundred years," and in every one of them "a Church Council, consisting partly of elders, who were not teachers."[7]

XX.—9. The true *Non-conformist* affirms—"that it is the consentient opinion of the best searchers on both sides, that in the primitive times, and for one hundred and

[1] P. 18. [2] P. 280. [3] P. 281. [4] P. 286.
[5] P. 280. [6] P. 279. [7] P. 283.

forty years after our Saviour, no vestige of Prelacy appears upon record."[1] This is pretty fair to begin with. He is as peremptory,[2] "that it was only the ancient prostasia (moderatorship) and not Prelacy that was in St Cyprian's time:" that "all the Epistle of the Roman Clergy to Cyprian, after the death of Fabian, contains, can amount to no more than a complaint of the want of a moderator;[3] and what though Jerome affirms that at Alexandria, from Mark the Evangelist to Heraclas and Dionysius, Bishops, "the Presbyters did always name one chosen of themselves, &c. placed him in a higher degree, &c. What says this more, than that in all that time, for order's sake, they had successive Presidents at first, it is like moveable, and thereafter fixed during life?"[4] Nay, "all the Prelacy that was in Jerome's time had not much exceeded the limits of a simple prostasia.[5] Once more, he tells his adversary—"that any man who knows Church History will easily grant that as for the first century and a half we have no vestige upon record of prelative power, so when προεστώτες (*i. e.* moderators) had place, their concurrence in presbyteries was only for order, as being the moderators;" and a great deal more to this purpose.[6] Indeed this mighty author doubted not to prove even from the Canons commonly called Apostolic, the unlawfulness of our Scottish Prelacy.[7] To this purpose he cites no fewer than ten or eleven of the first fifty; and to make the achievement the more surprising, he insists mainly on the 4th, 20th, 24th, 33d, and 36th,[8] (80th?)

XXI.—10. The author of the "Apology for, or Vindication of the Oppressed Persecuted Ministers," &c. published anno 1677, tells the Lords Temporal of his Majesty's Secret Council,—"that he and his brethren Presbyterians cannot meet with the least probable evidence for Diocesan Churches with one fixed pastor overseeing other pastors and their flocks, either in Scripture or pure antiquity." It is possible, indeed, that he added the epithet *pure* to antiquity, that he might be in safety to deny that

[1] P. 145. [2] P. 150. [3] *Ibid.* [4] P. 155. [5] P. 156. [6] P. 161. [7] P. 149.

[8] [It is worth observing by what sort of application of these Canons, the author mows down the "Bishops and Curates." The application of Canons 24 and 20 to them is most amusing, and reminds one of the charges brought against them at the Glasgow Assembly.—E.]

[9] P. 13.

it was any longer pure antiquity after the introduction of Episcopacy. But I think it more reasonable to understand him as meaning the same thing with the rest of his brethren, *i. e.* that Episcopacy is but a late corruption, a stranger to the three first centuries, for sometimes they can be so frank as to allow that those first centuries can be called pure antiquity.

XXII.—11. The admirable author of Rectius Instruendum,[1] assures us, "that one may as soon join the poles together, as prove by any faithful and authentic testimony that there was, either in the Apostles' times, or an hundred years and more afterwards, a Diocesan Prelate;" "and this," he says, "he speaks far within compass."[2] Now, if St John lived to the end of the first, by this reckoning there was no prelacy, at least for the two first centuries. I say at least, for his "far within compass," for anything I know, may extend to a great many more centuries; especially if we consider that he tells us again,[3] "that in those first times, when the Episcopus præses was set up, and for some *ages* afterwards, not only the Presbyters, but the people, had a great interest in their choice." And for this he cites Cyprian; from which it is plain, that according to this author, a Bishop in Cyprian's time was only an Episcopus præses, *i. e.* in plain Scotch, a Presbyterian moderator. Nay, to put his meaning out of doubt, he tells us,[4] "that even in Jerome's time the change was but small: a Bishop was only a fixed Moderator, and far from the present prelacy, for even then it was but come the length of taking from Presbyters, ordination, or rather the ritual part of it."[5]

XXIII.—12. I come now to G[ilbert] R[ule] himself, whom I have reserved to the last place, one as zealous as any to have Episcopacy a very late corruption. I shall only instance in two of his books, both of them published since the beginning of the late revolution. These are the words of his 12th proposition, in his "True Representation of Presbyterian Government," printed anno 1690. "The Lord hath equally entrusted all his servants, the

[1] [Thomas Forrester, afterwards Principal of St Mary's College, St Andrews.—E.] [2] P. 187. [3] P. 228. [4] P. 261, 262.

[5] [These quotations, though giving a correct meaning, are not strictly verbal.—E.]

ministers, not only with the power of dispensing the Word and Sacraments, but also with the power of governing the Church, which by his appointment, and according to the practice of the *first* and *best ages* of the Church, ought to be, and *was done*, in common, by ministers *acting* in *parity*, and not by a single Prelate set over the rest. This is acknowledged by *most*, and the *most eminent* of our prelatic brethren." Is not this bold enough.

XXIV.—But hear him again, in his "Rational Defence of Nonconformity," written against Dr Stillingfleet's "Unreasonableness of the Separation from the Church of England," published anno 1689. Dr Stillingfleet had argued for Episcopacy from the incredibility, (not impossibility, as G[ilbert] R[ule] calls it), of such a sudden change of the government of the Church from the plain institutions of Christ, and the unalterable rules of government which he had fixed in his Church.[1] And G[ilbert R[ule] answers, "that it was not done suddenly, but by insensible steps, in the space of three or four hundred years." "Cyprian," says he, "lived in the third century, and Diocesan Episcopacy was not then settled."[2] Again, "we deny that Diocesan Episcopacy prevailed in the Church for the first three hundred years, or that it was generally in the fourth century; and we are willing to enter the lists with our brethren, on this debate about the first and purest antiquity of Church Government."[3] "And what Jerome saith, *toto orbe decretum est*, is not to be understood of the decree of an Oecumenick Council, for no such decree can be produced; but this remedy of schism (*i. e.* Episcopacy) in many places began *then* to be thought on; and it was no wonder that this corruption began *then* to creep in, it being *then* about the end of the fourth century when Jerome wrote."[4] Again, Dr Stillingfleet having laid it down as an inviolable rule in St Cyprian's time that there would be but one Bishop in a city, G[ilbert] R[ule] tells him—"he is little concerned in this, that he can see no rule for it, except a canon of Conc. Cabillon.[5] which was but provincial, and very

[1] Unreasonableness of Separation, p. 226.
[2] Rational Defence, &c. p. 157. [3] P. 159. [4] P. 170.
[5] [Châlons, in France, where several Provincial Councils have been held. This here referred to was in 650, not 654. See Gallia Christiana, *in loco*. —E.]

late, under Pope Eugenius, about the year 654, yet methinks it was generally practised, for taking a Bishop," says he, "for the προέστως (*i. e.* moderator) among the presbyters, which I affirm to have been the dialect of those times, what needed more Bishops than one, seeing all the presbyters of one city might conveniently meet, ordinarily, for the exercise of discipline?"[1] Nay, if we may believe him, there was plain Presbytery in Alexandria in Athanasius's time. He was moderator, and the presbyters of the Churches of Mareotis[2] belonged to that Presbytery.[3] Again, Dr Stillingfleet had insisted on the testimony of Theodoret; and G[ilbert] R[ule] answers,[4] "the Doctor insulteth much on this testimony, but without cause, for Theodoret lived in the fifth century; and we deny not but by that time Episcopal ambition had in some places encroached on the government instituted by Christ, and which had been kept more entire in former ages." Now it is certain Theodoret did not give that account on which Dr Stillingfleet laid such stress before the year 420. Once more, Dr Stillingfleet had cited the canons of the African Church in St Austin's time; and G[ilbert] R[ule] answers—"what he saith of the African Churches, &c. let him prove that a Bishop, by himself, exercised discipline in them: The Bishop is often named as the Speaker in the Presbytery; by declining of him is meant declining of them."[5] So that even in St Austin's time (who lived till the year 430), nothing but pure Presbytery in the African Churches.

XXV.—It had been easy to have adduced a great many more citations from G[ilbert] R[ule]'s writings to this purpose, but these may be sufficient; for from them we may see it plain enough, that by his reckoning, Episcopacy is an arrant novelty, an usurpation not thought on before the end of the fourth century, beginning to make encroachments on Christ's true government in the infancy of the fifth century, not come to any considerable height till that century was well grown, perhaps hoary headed; nay, acknowledged to be a novelty by *most*, and the *most eminent* prelatists; so that it was but in conformity to his

[1] P. 174, &c.
[2] [A region near a lake of that name, not far from Alexandria.—E.]
[3] P. 177. [4] P. 178. [5] P. 189.

old, his fixed, his often repeated principles, that he was so confident in his "Defence of his Second Vindication," in that paragraph which gave occasion to "The Principles of the Cyprianic Age."

XXVI.—Thus I have made it appear, by a full dozen of instances, how much unanimous our Scottish advocates for Presbytery have been in representing Episcopacy as a notorious novelty; that is, in plain terms, how unanimous they have been in abusing the people, and imposing on them for undoubted truth a most groundless, gross, notorious falsehood. Whether their unanimity in this matter has proceeded from their unskilfulness in Church History or from sinister design—whether they have so boldly advanced such an untruth with or without competent knowledge of antiquity—or whether they could conscientiously advance it either with or without such competent knowledge—is not my present business to determine. All I do now aim at is to shew the reasons which moved me to enquire into the Principles of the Cyprianic Age with regard to Episcopal power and jurisdiction. And that our Brethren's so very zealous obtrusion of such false history on their disciples, was one good reason for such an undertaking, (if not clear enough already), shall be made fully clear very soon; that is, after I have named one consideration more, which likewise prompted me to such an undertaking. And it is,

XXVII.—III. That the fixing of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age appeared to me to be of considerable usefulness for determining one controversy, which for many years we have had with our Presbyterian Brethren—the controversy concerning the sentiments of our Reformers, and the principles on which at first they settled the government of this National Church. For divers years before I knew of any such book as that called "The Fundamental Charter of Presbytery," &c., I had observed that same very thing which that author has told us from Knox's History, viz.—"that our Reformers proposed to themselves the Scriptures, not simply, indeed, neither as sensed by their own or any modern glosses, but as sensed and interpreted by the principles and practice of the Primitive Church, as their rule according to which they resolved this

Church should be reformed." And now to bring home these considerations to that for which I designed them.

XXVIII.—Having considered these three things, and withal having reflected on the Cyprianic Age—the age to which G[ilbert] R[ule] had so confidently appealed—I found it an age which had all the advantages which one could reasonably desire to determine him to fix the principles of it, if he was inclined to fix the principles of any age after that of the Apostles, and not only so, but that age did likewise appear to me most perfectly to answer my design with respect to the aforesaid three considerations.

XXIX.—I. I say it appeared to me an age which had all the advantages needful in reason to determine one to fix its principles, who was inclined to fix the principles of any age after that of the Apostles. Particularly,

XXX.—1. It had this great advantage, that it was an age in which secular Governments had not yet shewn any tokens of favour, any expressions of kindness, to those who professed the Christian principles: much less had they imparted any thing of temporal greatness, or given any secular encouragements to the governours of Christian Churches. It was an age which, as much as any before it, had all the humiliation, and all the purification, all the admonition, and all the correction, and all the sharp discipline, and all the solid refinement, which persecutions, both violent and frequent, could give it—an age very far from being apt to cherish ambition, or the affectation of any undue or unwarrantable heights in professors of Christianity—an age in which the being an eminent governour of the Church was the exposing of the person, whoever he was, to the first brunt of the fiery trial—an age, indeed, liable to none of the popular objections commonly mustered up against some following ages—an age on which it could not be charged that either the favour of princes, or the abundance of riches, or the pomps of the world, or the privileges and immunities of ecclesiastics, or any thing of that nature, hath corrupted it.

XXXI.—2. It had likewise this great advantage, that it was an age of much ecclesiastical business; none after the Apostles had more. It was an age in which divers schisms happened, and divers considerable questions, espe-

cially concerning matters of discipline and policy, were tossed and ventilated. There were the schisms of Novatian at Rome, and Felicissimus and his complices at Carthage. There was the momentous point of discipline about the penances and reconciliations of the lapsers; and the every whit as momentous, but much more difficult question about the validity of heretical and schismatical baptisms and ordinances; whereupon happened the notable dissension between Stephen, Bishop of Rome, and St Cyprian, Firmilian, and a great many more great men, members of the Episcopal College. These, and divers other considerable events which happened in that age, gave frequent opportunities for frequent synods and convocations of great clerks, for frequent correspondences by ecclesiastical embassies, for frequent discussions of considerable matters by Episcopal and Synodical Epistles. In short, it was an age of much and great actions, by consequence an age singularly fitted for affording considerable discoveries of the methods of the administration and exercise, as well as of the frame and constitution of the government of Churches. Add to this,

XXXII.—3. That it was an age of great men, such as Fabianus, who was miraculously promoted to the See of Rome; Cornelius, Lucius, Stephanus, Xystus, his successors; Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, Alexander of Jerusalem, Fabius of Antioch, the great Dionysius of Alexandria, Gregorius Thaumaturgus, the vastly learned Origen, and a great many more whose names Eusebius has recorded; especially the admirable St Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage. All these, I say, were very great men, most of them singularly good men, many of them glorious martyrs. Not to mention Novatus and Novatianus, and such others as bred disturbances to the Church; though, when such are men of parts (as it is certain Novatianus was), their projects and plots, their motions and their applications, their nimble arts and politics, cannot but contribute much for coming by the knowledge of the principles which then prevailed.

XXXIII.—4. It was an age that was in a manner singular for this advantage, that it had transmitted to posterity many excellent records, many Synodical Epistles and forms and constitutions; many Epistles of all sorts, Epistles from Bishops to their clergy; from Bishops to Bishops,

from all parts of Christendom; many of them still extant; from which being accurately sifted, with the help of other monuments, I judge it no insuperable task to draw an intelligible scheme of the principles which then prevailed, with regard to Church government. Particularly, the excellent monuments of the excellent Cyprian, not only justly valued as incomparable records of antiquity by the most learned moderns, but also honoured with the greatest veneration by the greatest ancients; by none more than Jerome himself, our brethrens' most zealously pretended patron, as were easy to prove if it were needful. These four are certainly very great advantages of that age; but then there are other two, which to me appeared to be of no less, if not of greater consequence. Namely,

XXXIV.—5. The Cyprianic Age had this advantage, that the extraordinary manifestations and communications of the Divine Spirit had not then ceased, but continued in very great plenty, as may be observed everywhere in the writings of St Cyprian and his contemporaries, as I shall afterwards have occasion to discourse more fully.[1] How great an advantage is this! For how incredible is it that those who had such frequent and distinct manifestations of the mind of God communicated to them in an extraordinary manner, by that same Spirit which directed the Apostles in constituting the government of Churches, should have quite overturned that constitution and set up another? And this advantage will be found to be of yet greater weight and consequence, when it is adverted to, that those, who lived in that age, do particularly insist on those manifestations as signal in the designation and promotion of persons to the Episcopal office, and in the directing, protecting, vindicating, encouraging them in the administration of that office, to which they were so extraordinarily promoted. But of these things (as I said) more fully hereafter.

XXXV.—6. The last great advantage which I shall name, and which I have reserved to the last place, because I am to discourse it a little more fully, is, that those of the Cyprianic Age were not so far removed from the times of the Apostles, but that they might have been very well acquainted with the state of government in which the Apostles

[1] Cap. x. sect. vii. &c.

left the Churches, before they left the world. For if you reckon from the death of the Apostle St John to St Cyprian's promotion to the See of Carthage, you shall find only one hundred and forty-eight, or at most one hundred and fifty years. And now I ask (not what impossibility, but) what difficulty could there be in tracing the constitution of Church government through the neither many nor uneasy stages of one hundred and fifty years? Common sense tells us that nothing can be more traceable than notable changes in the public government of societies. The well-being of every society has such an intimate dependence on the temperament and constitution of its government, that nothing about it can be of greater consequence to it, and if so, then certainly nothing about it can lie open to more observers, or nicer observation. Few members of the society but must find in it their share or their privilege, their expectation or their security, something or other, some way or other, that may oblige them to have their eyes upon it. All this must be obvious to any thinking person.

XXXVI.—It is equally evident that substantial innovations in the government of the Church must be exposed to as accurate observation as in the government of any other society. The Church is a society erected on the surest foundation, and for the noblest ends; for securing and promoting men's greatest and most precious interests. If therefore those interests do depend as much on the public government of the Church, as the interests of other societies do on their respective governments, and if substantial innovations in the governments of other societies are so naturally attractive of the accuratest observation, they must needs be so, in the highest degree, in the government of the Church. Besides this,

XXXVII.—The Christians of the Cyprianic Age were peculiarly bound, both by principle and interest, to have observed and resisted such innovations with a peculiar accuracy. It was not only a received principle then, that the government of the Church was settled by the Apostles, who were acted and assisted by an infallible Spirit, but also (as afterwards I shall shew more fully,[1] that all innovations, all recessions from Apostolic institutions and determinations, were highly

[1] Chap. 10, sect. lvi. lvii.

criminal and execrable. Indeed, if we take our measures by the principles which then prevailed, we will find reason to believe that substantial innovations would neither have been more readily nor more accurately observed in the Creed than in the government of the Church. Neither can this seem a paradox to any man who has considered that the Creed of that age was not more concerned in any thing than the unity of the Church. And what one thing can have a stricter dependence on another, than the unity of the Church must needs have upon the constitution and administration of her government?

XXXVIII.—They were as much bound to guard against innovations by all the laws and ties of interest. Indeed, their principles led them to look upon innovations, especially *substantial* innovations in Church government, as highly dangerous to their greatest interests; as unavoidably inferring all the dangers that could result from neglecting Divine institutions, or forsaking Apostolic definitions, *i. e.* preferring their own fallible prudence to the infallible directions of the Holy Ghost, could amount to. Besides,

XXXIX.—How much was it the interest of Christians in those times to guard against all such innovations as might have had the least appearance of thwarting the definitions of the founders of their religion, when we consider them with regard to the enemies of their religion? How much was not only the spite of the Jews, but the zeal as well as the might of the then civil government of the then heathen world bent against them? How frequently, how miserably, how barbarously, how unmercifully were they persecuted, harassed, massacred, tyrannized over, upon pretence that they were fanciful and peevish, wilful and humorous, pure fanatics that had no solid nor accountable principles? And how much had it made for the relevancy of such pretences, if they had not firmly adhered to the original institutions of their founders? if they had deserted the first masters of their profession? if they had avowed by their practice that they were not afraid to make substantial deviations from those they owned and pretended to honour, as the holy, the infallible, the divinely inspired propagators of their religion? How easy had it been for their enemies, not only the philosophers, the Celsuses and Porphyries, who disputed and wrote against them, but also for the sovereign powers which

made the edicts, and the magistrates which executed them, to have formed such innovations and recessions from the institutions of their founders, into a strong and unanswerable argument, that they were but unconscientious pretenders to principles, especially to principles of Divine revelation, seeing they could so easily and unconcernedly depart from them, or run counter to them?

XL. — These things duly weighed, no more seems to remain to be considered but this, whether, however much the Christians of the Cyprianic Age might have been disposed both by principle and interest to have guarded against all innovations, yet the space of one hundred and fifty years was such, as that therein substantial innovations might have been made, and they not able to trace them? neither able to discover when they were made, nor if they were at all made? and, by consequence, whether they might not have swallowed down those innovations without any reluctancy? whether they might not have been so imposed on, as that though they really were very great, very dangerous, very scandalous innovations, yet they were so far from deeming them such, that they took them for the original institutions of their sect, handed down to them in that same integrity and purity, in which the Apostles committed them to their immediate disciples? This, I say, is the only remaining question—a question which, I think, may admit of a very easy and satisfactory decision. For certainly,

XLI.—All things considered, an hundred and fifty years was not so long a time, but that such a remarkable matter of fact as the instituted form of Church government, might very well have been traced from the end to the beginning of it. I cannot imagine that our Presbyterian brethren themselves can deny this: sure I am they ought not, in reason they cannot, till first they have much abated of, if not quite thrown up their ordinary confidence in, the same very controversy about Church government. For if those of the Cyprianic Age were in any such hazard of being deceived, while they had this back-scent to run only for one hundred and fifty, what security can our brethren have that they may not be deceived, when they have to run it back for more than fifteen hundred and fifty years? Who sees not that the disparity is very great between one hundred and fifty and fifteen hundred and fifty, or rather sixteen hun-

dred? Can our brethren lay claim to any more zeal, or any more sagacity, any more light, or any greater application, any more piety, or probity, or charity, or humility, or faith, any thing that may have more disposed them for the extraordinary favour of an infallible direction, than the Catholic Christians, the noble confessors, the glorious martyrs, the devout and holy Bishops and presbyters of the Cyprianic Age might have laid claim to? For example, has Mr Forrester or Mr Rule, or Mr Jamison, either more or greater advantages for knowing what was the form of government settled in the Churches by the Apostles, than Cornelius or Fabius, Origen or Dionysius, Firmilian or St Cyprian? But this reasoning being only *ad hominem*, I shall insist no longer on it; only I cannot see how our brethren can otherwise invalidate it, than by throwing up their wonted assurance, and acknowledging at least that it is every whit as possible, and much more probable for themselves to be, than it was for those of the Cyprianic Age to have been, in hazard of being deceived in this matter. But leaving this way of reasoning, as I have said,

XLII.—I do affirm that those of the Cyprianic Age had all the advantages that were needful to secure them against all danger of deception in such an inquiry. Besides all the canonical books of Scripture which they had in as great integrity as our brethren can pretend to have them; besides the extraordinary manifestations and directions of the Spirit, which certainly they had,[1] and to which our brethren, for any thing I know, can make no reasonable pretences; besides these, I say, they had many written records on which they might have relied as securely, and with as little fear of being deceived, as any man can rely on any records concerning any matter of fact.

XLIII.—They had not only the Epistles of Clemens, Ignatius, Polycarpus, &c. not only the larger volumes of Hegesippus, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, and innumerable other unexceptionable witnesses, to instruct them in this matter, but also the catalogues of Bishops in their regular successions to their respective Sees, carefully handed down to them from the very first foundations of those Sees. And they had vast numbers of epistles of many different kinds written by Synods to Synods, by Bishops to

[1] See Chap. x. sect. vii. &c.

Bishops, by Churches to Churches, about all things that happened, in which either the government or the discipline of the Church were interested. By all which monuments and records they might have as fully learned what had been the government instituted by the Apostles, and whether substantial innovations had been made in it, as we can learn by the records of the fifth or sixth centuries, what the form of Church Government was in those centuries.

XLIV.—Besides those advantages, the distance they lived at from the Apostles was not so great but that they might have very well trusted even oral tradition concerning such a remarkable and distinguishable matter of fact as was the form of government instituted by the Apostles. Even such as have no singular dexterity at thinking, may sufficiently perceive this by a very easy and a very plain supposition; for example, there can be nothing either obscure or uneasy in supposing that three men of common sense and common honesty, may (each of them) attain to seventy-two years of age. It is every whit as easy to suppose that the first of those three was born anno 80, the second, 132, and the third, anno 184; now, without supposing more, it is plain that the tradition might have been handed down very securely. For the second, at the twentieth year of his age, was both capable enough to receive, and might have received the account full and distinct from the first, who by the supposition was aged about twenty, before St John the Apostle died. And what should have hindered the third, when aged twenty, to have received it from the second, and withal to have been made a Bishop anno 248, (the year in which St Cyprian was made Bishop of Carthage), and to have continued in that station full eight years, and died at length of the supposed age of seventy-two? But indeed we need not lay the stress of this matter on any fancied supposition however reasonable; for,

XLV.—In the records of those times we have frequent instances of persons who might actually have handed down the tradition with the greatest security. Thus, for example, it is uncontroverted that Irenæus was so much contemporary with St Polycarp and Pothinus (his own immediate predecessor in the Episcopal chair of Lyons), that he not only might, but did actually learn from them what form of government the Apostles settled in the Churches.

Both, of their own proper knowledge, were capable to have taught him. According to the most accurate accounts, Polycarpus, aged eighty-six, died anno 147; by consequence, he was born anno 61, that is, he was aged 39 before St. John's death; nay, it is as certain as the certainty of history can make it, that he was consecrated Bishop of Smyrna by that Apostle. Pothinus was aged ninety, when he was raised to the glory of martyrdom, anno 167. Born then he was anno 77, aged 23, when St John died, Irenæus aged 50, before the death of St Polycarp, and 70 before the death of Pothinus, lived at least till the year 190. And what could have hindered a third to have received the accounts from him, which he received from Polycarpus and Pothinus, and withal to have lived till St Cyprian was made Bishop of Carthage? It is certain this might very well have been, though that third had not attained to the years of Polycarpus or Pothinus, or Irenæus. Again,

XLVI.—Alexander, Bishop of Jerusalem, who died not before the year 250, according to the common reckoning, was chosen assistant to Narcissus, Bishop of that See, about the year 212. And if he was then capable of administrating the Episcopal office, I hope he was capable of comprehending such accounts as Narcissus was able to give him. Now Narcissus was aged then about 116, as Alexander tells us in an epistle, whereof we have a fragment in Eusebius.[1] By consequence it is plain that he was contemporary with thousands who were contemporary with St John, and might have been contemporary with scores, nay hundreds, who were St Peter and St Paul's contemporaries. It were easy to adduce divers such instances to be found in ancient history, but it is needless; for indeed,

XLVII.—All mankind has still reckoned that tradition may safely and purely hand down signal events, or remarkable matters of fact through such a decurse of years. Nay, some of the greatest men have thought it highly reasonable to transmit to posterity as unquestionable history, matters of fact of far less consequence, and far less remarkable, upon the bare credit of tradition, after as many years as now we are discoursing of. I might adduce many instances, but I shall only name St Jerom, our brethrens'

[1] Lib. 6, c. xi.

pretended patron. He, in his account of Tertullian,[1] tells us as unquestionable truth, "that St Cyprian scarcely ever spent a day without reading something of Tertullian's writings," and that when he called for him, he said "*Da Magistrum*, give me my master." And this account he had from one Paulus an old man, who, when young, had it from St Cyprian's notary, the very person who had so frequently given him his "*master*." Now, it matters not *when* St Jerom wrote this account, seeing it is plain he might have written it at any time before his death, and by consequence more than one hundred and sixty years after the death of St Cyprian. And I dare refer it to any man of sense or ingenuity to determine whether there was any greater difficulty for those of the Cyprianic Age to have learned by tradition what the form of Church government was, which was settled by the Apostles—whether they settled it on the principles of parity or imparity—than there was for St Jerom to learn by it what value St Cyprian put upon the writings of Tertullian? Perhaps a great many other considerations might be adduced for representing how easy it might have been for those of that age to have discovered if any substantial innovations had been made in the constitution of the government of Churches after the days of the Apostles; but I shall only add one more. It is,

XLVIII.—That they had every way as great advantages for making such a discovery as we of this age can pretend to have for tracing the alterations of Government, either in Church or State, these one hundred and fifty years last past. Now, how many are there in Scotland who can travel backward through all the substantial innovations and changes which have been in the Civil Government of this nation these one hundred and fifty years? And as for Church government, how many of our brethren are very confident that they can very distinctly pursue it up to the first dawnings of our Reformation? (an interval of time much about the same length with that which was between the Apostolic Age and the Cyprianic). How many of them are persuaded that they can accurately account, not only for all the considerable alterations of Government since the Reformation, but also for the principles on which our Reformers at first

[1] [Liber de viris illustribus ad Dextrum.—Hieron. Op. curâ Vallarsii. —Ed. Veron. 1735, Tom. ii. p. 876.—E.]

did settle it? Nay, was it not on the supposition that it was easy to trace a matter of fact which lay at no greater distance than the Reformation, that in the beginning of the late Revolution the change which was made in the government of our Church, was founded on Prelacy's being, and having been, "a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to the nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people ever since the Reformation." And on this Church's "being reformed by presbyters," is it not on the same supposition that some of our brethren to this very day do continue so confidently to maintain that it was so? and that our Reformers, in settling the government of the Church, proceeded on the principles of parity? It is true, indeed,

XLIX.—*Ignorance* or negligence, prejudice or blind partiality, may induce men to make very false inferences, and draw very faulty conclusions, even from the clearest and distinctest, the solidest and most unquestionable suppositions, as I am verily persuaded some have notoriously done in the same very instance. But that does not in the least infer any real defect or weakness, any intrinsic unreasonableness or unserviceableness, nay, nor any considerable obscurity in the supposition. Men who have latitude of conscience, and suitable doses of willfulness, may deny the clearest and the fairest suppositions, and they may abuse the most solid and reasonable suppositions. What supposition can be clearer or more unquestionable, than that we may give credit to our senses about sensible objects, especially when we have no reason to suspect any vitiation either of our senses or the medium; when the senses of all men, of men of all employments, of all ages, of all persuasions, of all constitutions, of all nations, &c. are consentient in their testimonies about those objects? And yet we know the doctrine of Transubstantiation cannot be maintained without a contradiction to such a supposition. Just so men may abuse the fairest suppositions, by drawing ridiculous consequences from them. Thus Epicurus, and after him Lucretius, from the unquestionable supposition that men may give credit to their senses, drew this most ridiculous inference, that the Sun was no broader than a broad hat or so. And what then? Shall this wildness or willfulness of men who are not disposed for drawing just consequences from reason-

able suppositions, hinder such as are every way duly disposed for it, to draw just consequences from those suppositions, and that with as much assurance and security as if never a wrong consequence had been drawn from them? Certainly men may draw wild consequences from a supposition, even while they had all the reason in the world to judge it a most firm, a most solid, a most useful supposition, even for clearing that same very phenomenon about which they have actually erred. Nor can their having erred, afford them the least colour of a solid reason for rejecting the supposition after their error is discovered to them, especially if that discovery is made by the just use and application of the supposition. In such cases it is plain it was not the supposition that abused them, but they that abused the supposition, by making it, which was so naturally and genuinely fitted for the discovery of truth, subservient to the propagation of error. This I thought fit to add, that the reader may be satisfied that the error of our brethren about the principles of our Reformers can be no just plea for the weakness or unserviceableness of the supposition, that signal matters of fact may easily be traced for one hundred and fifty years.

L.—May it not be added as another argument, *ad homines*, of the reasonableness of this supposition, that though as much evidence as the nature of the thing is readily capable of, has been brought to prove that our brethren have notoriously mistaken the principles of our Reformers, yet hitherto, rather than call in question the reasonableness of such a supposition, they have chosen, I shall not say obstinately, but I must say very strangely, to maintain, in despite of all that evidence, that they have still been in the right in their assertions concerning the principles of our Reformers? This I am secure of,

LI.—Whatever others may object against the sufficiency of tradition for handing down such notable matters of fact for one hundred and fifty years, G[ilbert] R[ule], my present adversary, for shame can say nothing against it, at least without grossly contradicting himself he cannot call it in question. For in his Preface to his book which we have now under consideration, he cites St Augustine and Primasius, and he says " that these two African

Bishops could not but know Cyprian's mind." Now it is certain that these two Bishops lived at a greater distance from St Cyprian, than St Cyprian lived at from St John the Apostle. St Austin died not before the year 430, that is one hundred and seventy-two years after St Cyprian, and Primasius was alive after the year 450. And in his "Good Old Way Defended,"[1] he is angry at A[lexander] M[onro], D.D. for affirming that tradition is not to be believed or relied on, if it exceeds two hundred years. "This may suffer a little correction," says he, "and must not be taken for a principle, neither on his (A[lexander] M[onro], D. D.'s) authority, nor Du Launy's ——It is hard to fix a period how far oral tradition can hand down a story to posterity, especially if it be not about the credenda of religion. If I can believe a story of two hundred years old, from a grave and wise author whose veracity I do not question, I know not why the addition of fifty or one hundred years more should make it incredible, if it come from the same hand. Wherefore this is too peremptory a decision." Here you see G[ilbert] R[ule] fairly pleads for the sufficiency of even oral tradition for three hundred, that is twice one hundred and fifty years.

LII.—I have insisted the more fully on this advantage of the Cyprianic Age, not only to shew the reasonableness of my attempt to fix the principles of that age, but also because it may be useful for some things I may afterwards have occasion to discourse.[2] And now to bring all home to our present purpose.

LIII.—If such a notable and distinguishable matter of fact as the form of Church government settled by the Apostles may be clearly traced for one hundred and fifty years; if the Christians of the Cyprianic Age had all the advantages that were needful for tracing that settlement, or which is much the same, for discovering if any substantial innovations were made during such a period of time; more especially if they, living at much the same distance from the times of the Apostles at which we are from the time of our Reformation, were by parity of reason in as good circumstances for knowing the principles on which the Apostles settled the Government of the Christian Churches which they founded, as we at present are in for discovering

[1] Sect. 11, 2, p. 267. [2] Chap. X.

the principles on which our Reformers settled the government of this Church when they reformed it; if these things are so, I say then it must needs follow, by very good consequence, that the fixing of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age must be of very great usefulness for discovering the principles on which the Apostles proceeded in erecting the government of Churches, whether they did it on those of *parity* or *imparity*.

LIV.—These six advantages (and perhaps many more) had the Cyprianic Age; and as it had these advantages, so likewise,

LV.—I was satisfied that the fixing of the true principles of that age would most perfectly answer the design of those three considerations I have already accounted for, as the principal argument which moved me to such an undertaking.

LVI.—1. As for the first,[1] the application is so plain that it needs not to be insisted on. For if there was plain *imparity* between Bishops and Presbyters—if there was proper Prelacy lodged in the persons of Bishops even with regard to Presbyters—what more can be needful for representing the uselessness and the impertinency of those distinctions even to the dullest apprehension? Especially when they are made use of for evacuating the force of the testimonies of that age; much more, when they are made use of for evacuating the force of the testimonies of later ages; unless our brethren are willing to part with one assertion, which they use not to forget when they have occasion for it, namely, that the power of Prelates, after it once got footing, was still on the growing hand. Farther yet, considering what I have said, if it can be made appear that there was proper Prelacy in the Cyprianic Age, it must needs follow that the distinctions mentioned can never evacuate the force of the testimonies even of the ages that were prior to the Cyprianic Age. I say, considering what I have said, *i. e.* so long as we have so much reason to believe that those of the Cyprianic Age were far from innovating, or proceeding on principles different from the principles of former ages.

LVII.—2. If there was proper Prelacy in the Cypri-

[1] *Supra*, sect. 8.

anic Age, it must be as plain, not only that the authors I cited in the second consideration[1] have been very far wrong in their accounts—not only that they have exceedingly abused their credulous disciples in a very momentous point of Church History, but also that all persons who have any love to truth, and are not willing to have most false accounts imposed upon them, ought hereafter to look on our Scottish advocates for Presbytery as persons very capable of advancing very false propositions with very great confidence. By consequence, that they ought not to swallow down whatever is affirmed by them with whatsoever confidence, without examination. And if this could be obtained, (and it seems to me very reasonable that it should), I could then cheerfully entertain the hopes that our controversies about Church government, which hitherto have produced such fatal effects, might ere long be brought to an happy conclusion.

LVIII.—3. The fixing of the principles of that age did likewise seem to me very proper for determining (and that not by any far fetched consequences) the controversy above mentioned,[2] concerning the principles of our Reformers with relation to Church government. For that our Reformers laid down to themselves (and that very deliberately too) the aforesaid rule of Reformation, namely, the Scriptures as interpreted by the monuments and practice of the Primitive Church, our brethren dare not deny. It is recorded by their own prime historian, who tells us that in one petition, anno 1557, they addressed to the Queen Regent almost in the very terms of it, craving—"That the State Ecclesiastical might be reformed according to the rules and precepts of the New Testament, the writings of the Ancient Fathers, and the godly and approved laws of Justinian the Emperour;"[3] and near to three years after that, *i. e.* anno 1560, they proposed the same very rule to the Parliament as that which they would stand by, viz.—"The Word of God, the practices of the Apostles, and the sincerity of the Primitive Church.[4] Is not this argument enough, that this was their rule, their rule which again and again they had pondered? And now, may we

[1] Sect. 10, &c. to 26.
[2] Sect. 27.
[3] Knox, Hist. p. 131, in 4to.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 261.

not justly presume that our Reformers would have contented themselves with a reformation of the Ecclesiastical Estate agreeable to the pattern of the Cyprianic Age? Nay, did not this their own rule oblige them cheerfully to accept of such a Reformation? Do they not expressly distinguish between the practices of the Apostles and the sincerity of the Primitive Church? I ask, therefore, in what age after the Apostles could they have found more of the sincerity of the primitive Church than in that of St Cyprian? in what age, during the first three centuries, could they have found so full, so clear, so distinct information concerning the ancient constitution of Church government? Of all men on earth our brethren can have least to say against this consequence, so long as, on the one hand, they continue to pretend such a deference to the wisdom and integrity of our Reformers, and, on the other, that the state of the Church was not by far so much corrupted in the Cyprianic as in after ages, and particularly Justinian's.[1]

LIX.—IV. Besides these considerations I have hitherto insisted on, I had another which had some weight with me to determine me to such an essay, namely, that all things, especially the above mentioned advantages of the Cyprianic Age, considered, to fix the principles of that age seemed to me naturally to bring the main controversy between us and our brethren within a far narrower compass than is usual. The principles of that age once well fixed, I say, seemed to me to leave but very few other material enquiries to be discussed for ending the controversy. Perhaps only these two—1. Whether there be any evidence for any substantial alteration in the constitution of Church government between the Apostolic and Cyprianic Ages? 2. Whether the Apostolic writings are consistent or inconsistent with the Cyprianic constitution? This is plain, the principles of the Cyprianic Age once fixed, it is perfectly needless for determining the controversy to launch out into the vast ocean of later ages. And certainly had Gersom

[1] [This admirable summary of the value of St Cyprian's testimony, and that of his Age, scarcely requires any corroboration; but it may be as well to mention, that a similar opinion of their value is given by the learned Wall, in his Defence of the History of Infant Baptism against Gale.—Ed. Oxon. 1836, vol. iv. p. 444-5.—E.]

Bucer, Salmasius, Blondel, and many other advocates on both sides, confined the dispute within the limits of that age (wherein the learnedest Presbyterians do acknowledge[1] Prelacy to have notoriously prevailed) and the preceding ages, their books might have been much less bulkish and much more accurate; and so it had been much easier to such as had a mind for it, to try their citations, and the solidity of their reasonings from them.

LX.—Thus I have accounted for the considerations which moved me to attempt the collecting and digesting of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age. And I think G[ilbert] R[ule] by this time may see reason to believe, that however his rashness might have been the first thing that inclined me to such an attempt, and however the aspect of my book may seem to import that it was written of purpose to expose his rashness, yet there were far more valuable considerations at the bottom of it. And perhaps had I designed it for a publication, and finished it as it might have been finished, it might have appeared in another form; but the truth is, I had not designed it for the press, because through want of books I was not in a condition to finish it and make it so perfect as it might have been made.

LXI.—How happened it, then, that it was published? Thus, in short, I had learned that A[lexander] M[onro], D.D., then at London, intended to publish something for the correction and conviction of the "Vindicator of the Kirk." I therefore frankly made him the offer of my papers, that if either my thoughts or my collection of testimonies could be serviceable to him, he might make use of them. He as frankly entertained the offer. I sent my papers to him. He having another opinion of them, it seems, than I had, did instantly, without ever acquainting me with it, put them in the hands of Mr Kettleby. So soon as I learned this from another hand, I was not a little surprized. Considering the distance I then lived at from London, it was obvious to me that such a small number of sheets would be sooner cast off than that I could order for them such a preface as they needed. All I did, therefore, was instantly to write to London, craving only that it might be told what edition of

[1] See chap. iii.

St Cyprian's Works I had made use of, namely, that which was procured by the learned Dr Fell, sometime Bishop of Oxford; and that one very short amendment, or rather alteration, might be made in my papers. But the book was printed off before my letter reached London, and so neither of the two was done.

LXII.—The amendment I was desirous should have been made, was of those words which you have in the end of page 47—" Nay, who may be such, and yet no Christian? For however inexpedient or indecent it may be that an heathen should on occasion be the moderator," &c., into these—" Nay, who may be such, and yet no Church officer? for however unusual it may be, that a mere layman should on occasion be the moderator," &c. I could have been satisfied that this alteration had been made, not that I think there is any great difficulty in defending it as it was published against G[ilbert] R[ule], but because I was unwilling to have the least stroke in my book that was not in appearance as well as really innocent. One thing is evident, viz. that though it was no ways defensible, yet nothing of the stress of my cause depends upon it.

LXIII.—I am now satisfied that it had been reasonable to have made some other little amendments; particularly one. It is said, p. 79, that " perhaps besides Rogatianus, Britius, and Numidicus, there were many more Presbyters at Carthage who would not join with Felicissimus." Now that I have again considered the matter, I am apt to think there were at that time no more Presbyters in Carthage than the aforesaid three, and the five who sided with Felicissimus. And so much concerning the occasion, the reasons of writing, and the publication of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age.

CHAPTER II.

THIS VINDICATION, HOWEVER SIMPLY UNNECESSARY, YET IN A MANNER NEEDFUL FOR STOPPING THE MOUTHS OF OUR PRESBYTERIAN BRETHREN.

SECT. I. HAVING accounted for the writing of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age in the preceding Chapter, I come now to account for my being at any pains to vindicate them; and to tell truth, I am afraid I shall have hard work in making it accountable: so little do they seem to need a vindication against any thing G[ilbert] R[ule] has said in his book. And indeed that there can be no great necessity of vindicating them, and that I might very reasonably have declined to have any farther business with G[ilbert] R[ule] about them, may sufficiently appear from the following considerations. And,

II.—I. Besides that he has indeed left all my arguments in their full force, as I am confident every competent judge will acknowledge he has done, he has more than once, and more than one way, yielded all that I intended, viz. that there was real *Prelacy*, real *imparity of power*, as well as honour, between *Bishop* and *Presbyter* in *St Cyprian's* time.

III.—He has, I am sure, yielded it as far as plain shuffling and tergiversation can be constructed to be yielding. He has said, that he "never laid the stress of his cause on the practice or principles of the Church after the Apostolic Age."[1] I know not what he may mean by his cause; but it is plain that, on the principles of the Cyprianic Age, he laid the

[1] Cyprianic Bishop examined, p. 2, sect. 2.

stress of a cause as weighty as his being or not being a schismatic can amount to. And was not this the cause he was mainly concerned in, so far as my book could make him concerned? Neither shall he ever be able to make other than tergiversation of what he has farther said,[1] viz. "That had he imagined that so large a book as mine would have been built on that passage of his Defence of his Second Vindication," which I took to task, "he could have told me that though he might be bold to venture his credit on the Cyprianic Age; and though his cause, duly and distinctly stated, would suffer no loss by being tried at that bar, yet he would not quit the more divine letters-patents that he has for Presbytery, to rest in this, either as his only or his chief strength." This, I say, is arrant tergiversation; for what can be plainer than that his words in the passage I examined, cannot admit of any such gloss? The passage being but short, I shall here again transcribe it. It is this:—

IV.—Arg. 4th.—Cyprian's notion of schism is when one separateth from his own Bishop; this the Presbyterians do; *Ergo* A. All the strength of this argument lieth in the sound of words; a Bishop in St Cyprian's time was not a Diocesan with sole power of jurisdiction and ordination; if he prove that, we shall give Cyprian and him leave to call us schismatics. A Bishop then was the pastor of a flock, or the moderator of a Presbytery. If he can prove that we separate from our pastors, or from the Presbytery, with their moderator, under whose inspection we ought to be, let him call us what he will. But we disown the Bishops in Scotland from being our Bishops; we can neither own their episcopal authority nor any pastoral relation that they have to us. These are his own words and his own points; and now judge if he laid not the stress of the cause, in which I engaged with him, on the principles of the Cyprianic Age, and if his words are capable of admitting such a gloss as he would put upon them. But this is not all.

V.—He has undeniably granted that there was real prelacy in St Cyprian's time, or which is all one, that Presbyters then did not act in parity with their Bishop, and that

[1] Cyp. Bishop exam. p. 3, sect. 3.

a Bishop then was truly more than a Presbyterian moderator. This, I say, he has granted undeniably; I do not say plainly, for indeed he seems on some occasions to have been at pains to word the matter so mystically and obscurely, as one who did not reverence his age and character would think he might safely swear that there is gross nonsense in the case. And that which makes the obscurity and mysteriousness of his language the more observable is, that it is so most notoriously, when and where he complains that I had not stated the controversy so plainly as was to be wished; and therefore he undertakes to state it more distinctly. "We deny not," says he,[1] "that in Cyprian's time there were *some advances* made towards *some sort* of Prelacy, though the *parity of power* was not then *wholly* taken away." What can be, if this is not, pure mystery? For what, I pray, can be the sense of these words—"There were some advances made towards some sort of Prelacy?" What idea do they, can they represent to any man's understanding: If any at all, what else can it be but this, that in St Cyprian's time there was a Prelacy, even a Prelacy of power? This appears from the next words as much as anything can appear from them. "Though the *parity of power* was not then *wholly* taken away." If this, I say, have any sense at all, must it not be, that in St Cyprian's time the parity of power was *in part* taken away, though not *wholly*? I said if it have any sense at all, for to my understanding if you take the least imaginable part from parity, you shall forthwith have imparity. If you take unequal parts from equals, what remains must be unequal, to me is every whit as true, as if you take equal parts from equals, what remains must be equal. When I read Simplicius's commentary on the 33d Chapter of Epictetus, it never entered into my head to quarrel with him for reckoning it as much a common notion, that "that which is equal neither exceeds nor is exceeded, as that twice two make four." In short, I have always thought that parity consisted *in indivisibili*; nor do I expect ever to understand how the distinction of *wholly* and in *part* can be applicable to it. Briefly, let G[ilbert] R[ule], if he can make sense of what he has here said

[1] *Ibid.* p. 10, sect. 9.

otherwise than by granting, that in St Cyprian's time the parity of power was taken away.

VI.—That this is all the sense that can be made of it seems farther clear from what he immediately subjoins, viz.—" That the mystery of iniquity, as in other things, so in that, did begin early to work, even in the days of the Apostles, when Diotrephes did φιλοπρωτεύειν, affected to be Primus Presbyter, or Προεστὼς, or Moderator, in their meetings: That this προστασια becoming fixed and constant, after the Apostles' times, (these good men not foreseeing the ill use that others would make of that handle given them), it did by insensible degrees degenerate into an undue usurpation, as it is hard to get power kept within its due bounds, even among the best men." And that thus " the primitive power of Presbyters was gradually wrested out of their hands by the ambition of some, and by the innocent simplicity of others!" All this, I say, seems to make it clear that what I have said, was the true meaning of his mysterious language. And it seems farther clear from what yet follows, at least as far as one mysterious period can bring light to another:—" Many other corruptions," says he, " had crept into the Church by that time; and the declension from *absolute parity* went along with them. The name Ἐπίσκοπος began to be appropriated to the Προεστὼς, and that custom being confirmed by a little time, made even humble men[2] imagine that some different power was signified by that name that they had distinct from others; which the rest who were so usurped upon did too easily yield, minding more the work of feeding than of ruling the flock, and not seeing the fatal consequents of it, which afterwards ap-

[1] Cyp. Bp. exam. p. 10, 11.

[2] [As an instance of the repetition of arguments on their side by Presbyterian writers, I may mention that Dr Campbell has used this to account for the origin of Episcopal power, and has endeavoured to shew that ambition—the usual cause assigned—was not the source of it. " So far am I," says the learned Principal, " from thinking that the *ambition* or the *vices* of the first ministers gave rise to their authority, that I am certain that this effect is much more justly ascribed to their *virtues*. An aspiring disposition rouses jealousy—jealousy puts people on their guard. There needs no more to check ambition, whilst it remains unarmed with either wealth or power. But there is nothing which men are not ready to yield to *distinguished merit*, especially when matters are in that state, wherein every kind of pre-eminence, instead of procuring wealth and secular advantages, exposes but to greater danger, and greater suffering." Lectures on Ecclesiastical History. Vol. I. p. 181.—E.]

peared, and were not discovered till it was too late to retrieve them."

VII.—In which period, I say, we have more mystery. So I must reckon of it till G[ilbert] R[ule] shall explain what he means by *absolute parity*, and tell what is the other member of the distinction that may be reasonably set in opposition to it. I know there are divers terms which such as are clever at distinguishing use as they have occasion to oppose to *absolute*, such as dependent, accountable, imperfect, relative, conditional, &c. But I cannot find any one of them that may answer to *absolute*, when it is joined to *parity*. But I am willing to be as easy to G[ilbert R[ule] as I can, and therefore I shall press this no farther, if he will but grant (that which I think any reasonable man would grant, viz.) that every *declension* from *parity*, whether *absolute* or *not absolute*, must necessarily result into an *imparity*.

VIII.—The rest of this period, if not as good mystery, is, however as pleasant, and as useful for our present purpose. The appropriation of the name Ἐπίσκοπος (Bishop) to the Πρόεσπως (Moderator) and a little time's confirmation of that custom, "made even humble men imagine that some different power was signified by that name, that they had distinct from others," &c. what can be more pleasant? Is not this the plain meaning. That though Bishops looked on themselves, and were looked on by Presbyters as having more power than Presbyters in St Cyprian's time, yet they had it not. And it was a mistake in both Bishops and Presbyters that they thought so. That this is the meaning, seems farther plain from G[ilbert] R[ule]'s frequent repetition of this fine speculation. For, sect. 25,[1] he says,—"It was lamentable that the Episcopal promotion began then (when the controversy was between Cornelius and Novatianus about the Chair of Rome) to be more esteemed than was meet, and was *looked on as a prelation* above the other brethren." And sect. 53,[2] "It was the genius of that age to have too big thoughts of that prelation of being *primus Presbyter*; and the best of men, in that time, were tinctured with this mistake, *i. e.* good men." They *thought* there was Prelacy amongst them, but it was not so for all that.

[1] P. 30. [2] P. 79.

Now it is unavoidable that either this, however ridiculous, must be G[ilbert] R[ule]'s meaning, or that even in those times there was manifest imparity, though he was unwilling to speak it out plainly.

IX.—It were easy to adduce more of his concessions to this purpose: Thus, sect. 20,[1] he grants that "a Bishop in those times, by reason of his fixation in that office, and by custom, had crept into some more power over the College of Presbyters than was due." Now, if *creeping* must be the word, I would only gladly know how he could have "crept into some more power than was due," without creeping into an imparity of power? Once more, sect. 44,[2] answering the argument I had brought, for the Bishops' power of ordination, taken from the instance of Fabianus his ordaining Novatianus, a presbyter, not only without the consent, but against the inclinations of both clergy and people, he says "it was the practice of an aspiring Pope." It is not my business at present to chastise G[ilbert] R[ule] for so uncharitably bestowing such an ill-sounding name on that excellent person, though it were very easy to do it. And I believe G[ilbert] R[ule] is the first man that ever attempted to diminish the honour of his memory. All I am concerned for is, to desire the reader to judge whether it is not more than probable that G[ilbert] R[ule], when he pronounced him "an aspiring Pope," had some other idea in his head than that of either single Presbyter or Presbyterian Moderator? or rather, that he had the idea of something more and greater than an ordinary Diocesan Bishop?

X.—Divers other such concessions of his might be adduced, by which he has fairly granted all I pleaded for. But these may be sufficient, especially when, besides those concessions, all along through his whole book he has been forced, for avoiding the dint of my arguments, to flee to the sorry plea of the sole power of ordination and jurisdiction, &c. And now what need of vindicating my book, when my adversary has so fully and so frequently yielded all it was designed for? But this is not all, for

XI.—II. A judicious and attentive reader may easily find it more than probable that G[ilbert] R[ule] has applied

[1] P. 24. [2] P. 64.

himself to write his "Cyprianic Bishop Examined," without having read the not very voluminous works (as he calls them) of St Cyprian. That he had not read them over before he wrote that paragraph in his defence of his Second Vindication, which gave occasion to my book, seems clear enough. For how can any thinking man imagine that G[ilbert] R[ule] would have been so inadvertent, had he been acquainted with St Cyprian? Besides, I have it very credibly, that when first my book came to his hands, he went to the library of his College, and called for St Cyprian's works; and when the keeper produced them, of Pamelius his edition (none of the smallest volumes in which they have been published), he was surprised, and asked if these were all St Cyprian's writings? were there no more volumes of them in the library? Now let the reader judge if this looked like one of St Cyprian's acquaintances. Did it not rather look like one who had imagined that I could not have adduced so many citations, but from such voluminous authors as St Austin or St Chrysostom?

XII.—But are there any shrewd presumptions that he had not read St Cyprian before he wrote his "Cyprianic Bishop Examined?" One would think that it were scarcely to be imagined that had he read St Cyprian, he could have had the resolution to have written such a book. It may be likewise thought that, considering all his functions (for G[ilbert] R[ule] is not only Principal of the College, but also a Minister in Edinburgh, and has a very large parish), he had scarcely time to read him accurately, and withal write his book so soon as he wrote it. But these I do not, I need not insist on, having so many fair arguments in his book—arguments which want no more to make them demonstrations but one supposition, which I am hopeful he will readily grant, this, that he is a man of common sense and common ingenuity. These supposed, I have these arguments.

XIII.—I had cited St Cyprian's 7th, 34th, 45th, and 59th Epistles, to prove that there were Acolyths in St Cyprian's time.[1] And G[ilbert] R[ule] says[2] he was at the pains to read over all those Epistles of Pamelius's edition, but did not find one word of Acolyths in any of them; and

[1] Cyprianic Age, p. 5.

[2] P. 17, sect. 13.

so he leaves the matter, as if I had had no ground to cite St Cyprian's authority for Acolyths. Now, if he had read over all St Cyprian's Epistles, even of Pamelius's edition, he could not have missed those very accounts of Acolyths which I had given, in Ep. 36, 28, 42, 55, according to Pamelius's numbers. But if he had found them in those Epistles, would not common ingenuity have obliged him to have confessed he had found them, though not in the Epistles as I had numbered them? Again.

XIV.—I had (upon occasion) cited St Cyprian calling the Episcopal degree, "The sublime top of the priesthood;" and G[ilbert] R[ule] answers,[1] "To Cyprian's words, 'the sublime top of the priesthood,' I should not doubt to give a satisfying answer, if I could find the place, and consider the purpose he is speaking of. But my antagonist (says he) hath made my work very difficult—by leaving me at uncertainties where to find any one of his citations, unless I either *stumble* on them *casually*, or read *all* St Cyprian's Epistles for every place that is cited." Now, supposing G[ilbert] R[ule] to be a man of common sense, it cannot be imagined that he meant that he could not find all my citations, unless he had read over all St Cyprian's writings as many times as I had adduced citations from them, *i. e.* divers hundreds of times. No doubt G[ilbert] R[ule] knows very well that any man of any head, with an ordinary attention, might have tried all my citations, if not at the first, yet doubtless at the second or third reading over of St Cyprian's writings; so that his plain meaning must needs be, that he could not find them, unless he either *stumbled* on them *casually* (which was not indeed to have been expected), or should have read all over St Cyprian's writings for them. And if this be his meaning, then 'tis plain he had not read them all over. Farther,

XV.—He says, sect. 23,[2] that after search, he cannot find where it is said that Sabinus was ordained successor to Basilides by imposition of hands. But if he had read Ep. 68, according to Pamelius, he had certainly found it. Sect. 33,[3] he cannot find these words, "Cathedram sibi con-

[1] Sect. 21, p. 25, 26. [2] P. 28.—[This is the sense of the words.—E.]
[3] P. 43.

stituere, et primatum assumere," by any direction I had given him; and therefore he cannot tell what might be said for vindicating them. Now, Pamelius has them, Ep. 76. Again, sect. 47,[1] he says, he can find nothing in Ep. 62 and 78, concerning the Bishop's power of imposing charitable contributions on his people, &c. And true it is, according to Pamelius's Numbers, there is nothing to that purpose in those Epistles. But had he read Ep. 60 and 79, common ingenuity would have compelled him to have confessed he found it in them. And, sect. 46,[2] he says, he knows no more where to find the places of Scripture on which I had said, "the Bishop's power of disposing of the revenues of the Church seemed fairly to be founded," than he knows where to find some places of Cyprian which I had cited. Now, I did expressly direct him to Mr Dodwell's first Cyprianic Dissertation, sect. 9, for finding a text fairly so interpreted, viz. 1 Peter, v. 2. But that is not the present matter. It is, that here we have a fair confession, that he had no more read over all St Cyprian's works for finding my citations, than he had the New Testament for finding those Scriptures. Once more.

XVI.—Having told, sect. 29,[3] that I had brought some citations that needed a little to be examined, he goes on thus:—"Although I can by no diligence find some of the places that he citeth, yet by *chance* I have light on these." Now certainly the easy diligence of reading over all St Cyprian's works with an ordinary attention (as I have said) might have afforded him every one of them. But this, it seems, was too laborious a diligence for G[ilbert] R[ule]. All the diligence he had used could not have discovered to him even those few testimonies which I had adduced for proving that, by the principles of the Cyprianic Age, the Bishop was the principle of unity to all the Christians within his district. He had not found them at all, if kind and helpful *chance* had not cast them up to him. By this time the reader may judge whether G[ilbert] R[ule] had read St Cyprian's writings, before he wrote his "Cyprianic Bishop Examined;" and by consequence, whether there can be any great necessity of a reply to him.

[1] P. 66. [2] P. 66. [3] P. 37.

XVII.—As for his frequent complaints, that I did not tell him what edition of St Cyprian's works I had made use of—besides that I have sufficiently accounted for that already[1]—I must farther tell him that his ignorance of the edition I made use of, is no great argument of his curiosity to know the best editions of books. I made use of the incomparably best edition of St Cyprian,—the edition ordered by the learned Dr Fell, and adorned by him with excellent notes; the edition in order to which the great Dr Pearson wrote that admirable piece of learning, "Annales Cyprianici," in which he reduced all St Cyprian's works, especially his Epistles, to the proper years, some to the proper months, in which they were written, and the incomparable Mr Dodwell wrote his "Dissertationes Cyprianicæ;" the edition which had its first impression at Oxford, anno 1682; a second at Breme, 1690; and a third at Amsterdam, 1691; at both these places, with such regard to the Oxford impression, and to the conveniency of finding citations in any impression of that edition, that (if I remember right) they have religiously kept by the same number of pages, nay, of lines, with the Oxford impression;—at both places, having annexed to St Cyprian's works (besides divers Tractates falsely attributed to him) both the abovementioned books, the "Annales Cyprianici," and Dissertationes Cyprianicæ." In short, an edition famous all Europe over; particularly accounted for and commended not only by the learned Dr Cave in his "Historia Literaria;"[2] not only by the Fasti Oxoniensis;[3] but also by Du Pin in his "Bibliotheca Patrum;" nay, even by G[ilbert] R[ule]'s friend Spanhemius, in his "Introduction to Church History;"[4] lastly, an edition which had all these impressions, and praises, and commendations, and perhaps many more, long before I had thought of having any controversy with G[ilbert] R[ule] about his being a schismatic by the Cyprianic principles. And now to return to my thread. What necessity can there be of a reply to G[ilbert] R[ule], who has so fairly yielded all I pleaded for, and who has never read St Cyprian?

XVIII.—3. But there are other considerations besides these two, which may justly make it seem needless

[1] Cap. 1, sect. 61.
[2] [Cave's Hist. Lit. vol. i. p. 90.—E.]
[3] [Fasti Oxon. Ed. Bliss, vol. vi. p. 198.—E.]
[4] Edit. 1689, p. 134.

to have any farther dealing with G[ilbert] R[ule], particularly his inhuman dealing with me. I shall not insist on trifling incivilities, such as his calling me confident at every turn, and twenty more of that nature; nay, I shall not much insist on that which perhaps he intended for a compliment,[1] though it be one of the sourest and most unpalatable ones I have met with, namely, "that my book was written in a more scholar-like and less unchristian strain than any he had before seen from men of my persuasion." What for a compliment is it thus to tell one that he writes unchristianly? And is it not plainly implied that I had written unchristianly, when it is said that I had only written in a less unchristian strain than others, is not less unchristian, still unchristian? And the compliment is still the sourer, when it is considered that that which only could smell of compliment in it, viz. that I had written scholar-like, is afterwards explained by him to have truly signified that I had written like a school-boy; for I had translated a saying of St Cyprian's otherwise, it seems, than G[ilbert] R[ule] would have had it done; and therefore he says, "If a school-boy should make such a version of Latin into English, he would be lasht for it."[2] All this I can easily digest, especially the making me a school-boy; for, indeed, however I have dared to tug a little with G[ilbert] R[ule], yet I am sensible I ought to pass for no better than a school-boy among men of learning; only, if I am a school-boy, it must contribute very little for G[ilbert] R[ule]'s honour if he shall defeat me, and less if he shall be defeated by me. But enough of this.

XIX.—That which I mainly aim at in this consideration, is G[ilbert] R[ule]'s inhumanity towards me in matters of greater moment than undervaluing or ungraceful compliment can amount to. He has divers times endeavoured to make me a Papist; but this I shall afterwards consider; nay, in effect, he has made me little better than an Atheist: for he has plainly affirmed, "that it is much more my inclination to write *ad hominem*, against a particular person, (*i. e.* himself) than *ad rem*, for that which I take to be the truth of God."[3] Now, how rankly must he smell

[1] P. 1. [2] P. 64. [3] P. 4.

of Atheism, who prefers such a pitiful and sorry victory as can be obtained over such a one as G[ilbert] R[ule] to the truth, that is in effect, to the glory of God? Neither had G[ilbert] R[ule] so much as the least colour of ground for such an assertion. It is true, indeed, he attempts to squeeze it from my having waved to enter into the main controversy between the Prelatists and the Presbyterians, and my having only endeavoured to chastise his rashness in my book. But he might, with as much reason, have inferred thence that I was a Presbyterian. There had been every way as good a connection between the premises and the conclusion. For by what imaginable consequence, or chain of consequences, can it follow that one puts a higher value on one thing than another, because he chooses to begin with it in his order of writing? Again, may not one at once write *ad hominem* and *ad rem* too? against a particular person, and for the truth of God? Is there any truth which is not God's truth? Whose, then, is it? And then I am sure it is not God's truth, (for it is not truth at all), that I waved to enter into the main controversy, unless G[ilbert] R[ule] can prove that delaying is waving; nay, unless he can prove that I may be justly said to have waved a thing, when I had expressly undertaken to discourse that thing so soon as he, to whom my letter was directed, should command me.[1] But this is not all.

XX.—G[ilbert] R[ule] has not only thus endeavoured to expose me as one of no religion, or at best, of a very bad one; but he has more than once or twice ascribed positions to me which it is impossible for him to prove to have been mine. Thus, sect. 10,[2] he says, that "I pleaded that Episcopal power was not only acted by some, but generally, in the Churches of the first, second, and third centuries, and approved by general consent." I do now tell him that I see no danger in asserting that Episcopal Government was instituted by the Apostles, and did prevail in all duly constituted Churches in part of the first, and through all the second and third centuries; nay, I verily believe it to be true; but I am very sure there is no such assertion *in terminis* in all my book; and I am as sure that the purpose of my book did not require any such assertion. Again,

[1] See Prin. Cyp. Age, p. 94. [2] P. 11.

sect. 36, he says,[1] "That I pretend to no less antiquity for my way than from the Apostles downward, yea, all the ages of the Church, and all the Churches of every age." Now, it is certain I never said so; I could not say so till I had first resolved to be both unconscientious and ridiculous, without any shadow of necessity. For before I wrote my book, I knew (what all Christendom knows) that there have been some Churches, in some ages, without Bishops, particularly many both in this age and the last. If such imputations are not arguments of injustice, certainly they are of inaccuracy in G[ilbert] R[ule]. But these are not the worst; for

XXI.—What can be more notoriously an imposition on his reader, as well as an act of injustice to me, than that which he has sect. 26, where he says,[2] "that I will say that the elders of Ephesus, whom the Apostle warns Acts. 20, 30, were Diocesan Bishops?" Who told him that I would say so? Had I given him any ground to imagine that I would say so in any page, or line, or syllable, of all my book? And now to convince even G[ilbert] R[ule] himself that he affirmed this at random, I do declare I will not say that those elders were Diocesan Bishops. Again, sect. 48,[3] he says "that I do call all Presbyters the Bishop's curates." Now, though I see neither grievous harm, nor great heresy in calling them so, yet if I called them so in any part of my book, I am satisfied that it be burnt with disgrace by the hand of the common hangman at the cross of Edinburgh. He has divers other such false assertions of me in his book, which, for brevity, I shall forbear to take notice of: Only,

XXII.—One more of such his notorious injustices I cannot neglect, because it is of great consideration in our main controversy. It is, that all along he makes me to maintain that the *sole power* of ordination and jurisdiction is lodged in the person of the Bishop. This he has at least ten times over in his book. More than once he makes me an assertor of this *solitude* of power (as he calls it),[4] with a witness, *e. g.* I had affirmed that every Church in St Cyprian's times was ruled by a Bishop, presbyters, and deacons. "And I observe," says G[ilbert] R[ule] sect. 14,[5]

[1] P. 47. [2] P. 32. [3] P. 70. [4] P. 21, sect. 17. [5] P. 17, 18.

" our author's unwariness in here asserting that the Church was ruled by Bishops, presbyters, and deacons, and yet he pleadeth for the *sole jurisdiction* of the Bishop in most part of his book. This I impute to the want of a good memory." And sect. 17,[1] " all this," says he, (that is, all he had taken notice of a little before), " tendeth to prove the Bishop's *sole jurisdiction*, which is afterwards to be considered when he insisteth on that point *on purpose*." So that it seems there is some part of my book in which, of set purpose, I undertook to maintain the Bishop's sole jurisdiction. And sect. 54,[2] he says that in the return that the presbytery at Rome made to St Cyprian,[3] " I fancied that I might find some arguments for Episcopal *sole power*," &c. And sect. 55,[4] he hath the same assertion over again. Now, when an ingenuous and honest reader, who expects no tricks, observes these and the like passages, what wonder if he believes that I had appeared a zealous advocate for the sole jurisdiction of Bishops? And yet, not only is there not so much as one syllable in all my book to that purpose, but on the contrary, I was at all the pains I could, to shew that I was not to plead for the Bishop's *sole power* of either jurisdiction or ordination. But of this more fully hereafter. All I mentioned it for at present was, that the reader may see how unfairly G[ilbert] R[ule] has dealt with me in this matter. And now to bring home this whole consideration to the purpose for which I designed it.

XXIII.—Can any great necessity lie on one to give any farther answer to G[ilbert] R[ule's] book than even to make such a discovery as I have made of his inhumanity and unfair dealing in it? Is it not presumable that he has found himself sadly straitened, when he was forced to betake himself to such unmanly and disingenuous shifts? though I had treated him either rudely or unfairly, it could not have justified such counter-treatment. No retaliation but the innocent can be justifiable. My sinning against him could never have legitimated his sinning against me. But indeed I did neither treat him unfairly nor rudely. I dealt so fairly with him, that I did set down his own words, and gave such a natural paraphrase on them, as he himself was

[1] P. 22. [2] P. 80. [3] Ep. 30. [4] P. 82.

forced to say,[1] "he had little to observe on it; and that he was ready to maintain all that I had made to be his opinion," except one thing, which yet may be made to appear to be his, with all the evidence the nature of the thing is capable of. I no where treated him rudely. He himself seems not to have found in all my book, (except that it was at all written), anything save one, that could awaken his resentment. In a certain book of his he had insinuated that it was pride in St Cyprian that made him write so to his presbyters, as he had done on some occasions. I had adduced enough of argument to purge the holy martyr of that most heinous sin; and then subjoined these words,[2] "but what I have said methinks might be enough in all conscience for defeating for ever that uncharitable, shall I say? or ignorant suggestion, that it was pride perhaps that prompted Cyprian to write so magisterially," &c. This, I say, seems a little to have awakened G[ilbert] R[ule]'s resentment.[3] I shall not say but it might have been otherwise worded: but I can assure him it was my tenderness of him that inclined me to impute the antichristian character he had bestowed on the holy man, rather to his ignorance than to his uncharitableness; for I did, and still do think, the former a far more innocent cause than the latter. This, as I have said, was all, in all my book, that G[ilbert] R[ule] would catch at, as importing rudeness to him. It is plain, therefore, that it has been nothing in my book—nothing, I say, but mere force of argument, that has irritated him to treat me so unhandsomely; and this consideration, as I have said, though there were no other to be added to the former two, may justly make it seem unnecessary to give him any farther reply. But, indeed, there are others every whit as weighty. Particularly,

XXIV.—IV. He has given so many remarkable instances of his weakness at reasoning, as may make it seem reasonable to forbear to meddle more with him. I take the great design of writing books to be, that others may be informed and bettered by them. Now, certainly it very seldom happens that much of those fruits is to be gathered, where all one has to do is to shew another's weakness or inadvertencies. And therefore, even where such undertakings may

[1] Sect. 8, p. 8. [2] Cyprianic Age, p. 63. [3] P. 18.

seem necessary, yet the quicker dispatch the better. So that I shall only give a specimen of such work at present. And I think I cannot begin with a pleasanter instance than that which he has, sect. 27.[1] There, accounting for the causes which (in his opinion) "made the Fathers overlash (as he words it) in their invectives against schism," he names only these two, "*holy zeal and excellent rhetorick.*" "It is well known," says he, "that the *holy zeal* of the Fathers, and the *excellent rhetorick* they were endowed with, made them overlash sometimes in their expression." Considering the controversy G[ilbert] R[ule] was engaged in, it was indeed his interest to extenuate the sin of schism (if it can possibly be any man's interest to extenuate any sin, and not rather to confess it and forsake it), and that it should not appear so black as the Fathers do unanimously make it: so that, had he imputed their bitterness against it to *blind zeal* or *painted sophistry*, he had but served that interest. But I must leave it to him who can, to comprehend how *holy zeal* and *excellent rhetorick* should have produced such a bad effect as an unjust condemnation of schism. Again—

XXV.—2. "It is very observable," says he,[2] "that Cyprian, Epistle 33, says that *Ecclesia in Episcopo et clero et omnibus stantibus est constituta.*"—"That the Church is settled in the Bishop, the Clergy, and all the faithful." Now would you know why this is so observable? Why? It proves this observable proposition—"It is not the Bishop that is the Church." And now was it not indeed very observable? for certainly it proves the weighty proposition to a demonstration. Again—

XXVI.—3. I had asserted that by the Cyprianic Principles, all Bishops were equal; from which G[ilbert] R[ule] gains a mighty corollary. Take it in his own words,[3] "I insist not on his first proposition," says he, "concerning the equality of Bishops; I only observe, that he is for parity in the Church, and if it be found among Bishops, I know no Scripture nor reason that condemneth it among Presbyters." And truly neither do I.

XXVII.—4. Having adduced two testimonies from Firmilian's Epistle to St Cyprian[4] to prove that he was a

[1] P. 35. [2] Sect. 28, p. 37. [3] Sect. 33, p. 42.
[4] Sect. 37, p. 49, 50.

full declarer for Presbyterian Government, he subjoins thus, "It is to be observed that frequent mention is made in this Epistle of *Episcopi*, Bishops; and Pamelius thinking that this Epistle being turned out of the Greek into Latin by Cyprian, to whom it was written, by Præpositus is meant Bishop, and by Senior, Presbyter; whence it is evident that here all Church power is ascribed to the Presbyter that is given to the Præpositus or Bishop." And so, by plain demonstration, we have Pamelius a Presbyterian. For what demonstration can be plainer than that he who will have Præpositus, to signify Bishop, and Senior, Presbyter, is for parity between Bishops and Presbyters.

XXVIII.—5. He adduces Jerome's Testimony[1]—"*Alexandriæ a Marco Evangelista usque ad Heraclam et Dionysium Episcopos, Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in excelsiori gradu collocatum, Episcopum nominabant.*" Now it is not his dishonesty in leaving out the immediately succeeding words—"*Quomodo si exercitus imperatorem faciat*," &c.—that I challenge, because the producing of them would have marred his whole plot; neither is it that he says, "it may fairly be deduced hence, that till anno Christi 246, all the power or authority that the Bishop had was given him by the Presbyters;" though even in this he is pleasant enough in point of chronology, (as if Heraclas had not been Bishop of Alexandria before the year 246), and in point of reasoning too, as if it were an unquestionable inference; though [that because] presbyters had the power of choosing and nominating their Bishop-elect—*ergo*, the Bishop had all his power and authority from them, but that which I take notice of is this good collection—"If, then, the Presbyters made a Bishop, it could not be alone, but the Bishop with them, and as one of them," the Presbyters, "who made Presbyters,"[2] who dares be so pert as to say that this is no good consequence?

XXIX.—6. Much like to this, and it may bring more light to it if it needs it, is his reasoning, sect. 42.[3] I had affirmed that it was easiness and condescension in St Cyprian, that he consulted his clergy in the matter of ordinations; and G[ilbert] R[ule] says, "this is inconsistent with what I say elsewhere," viz. That the Bishop was a

[1] [Hieron. Evagrio.—E.] [2] Sect. 40, p. 559. [3] P. 58.

Monarch, and the Presbytery his Senate. "I hope," says he, "he, *i. e.* I, will not say that it is *ex beneplacito* that Kings consult their Parliaments, unless he be for the Turkish government both in Church and State." Now here G[ilbert] R[ule] has certainly nicked me by native nimbleness at reasoning, for the point is about giving commissions to inferiour officers. And now, whatever come of the Turkishness of government, whether in Church or State, I do confess I have no reason to say that it is *ex beneplacito* that our Kings consult their Parliaments about granting commissions to inferiour officers, in either civil or military employments; because, though thousands of such commissions have been granted by such Kings as we have had, since I remember, yet I do not remember that ever any of these Kings did at all consult their Parliaments about any of those commissions, but gave them all without such consultation.

XXX.—7. It is every whit as good reasoning which he has, sect. 44, (p. 61,) "That the contentions that are about the number of the Canons commonly called Apostolic, make them all to be suspected." Only let the canonical books of Scripture see to it; unless there has never been any contention about the number of them. And—

XXXI.—8. In that same section he says that "my comparison of the Bishop's power with the rights of Majesty in giving commissions, is vain talk, unless I can prove a monarchy, and that absolute, in the Church." Right, Sir, for who can doubt that in a limited monarchy it is impossible it should be one of the rights of Majesty to grant commissions.

XXXII.—9. "One thing he cannot pass," *(ibid.)* namely, my saying "that after St Cyprian's time, it was appointed by the Canons that Presbyters should concur with Bishops in ordinations." Why could he not pass this? Because, forsooth, (page 62), "it overthrew all my discourse of the Bishop's majesty, sovereignty, incontrolable power, unaccountable power," &c. Now let him who can find out the necessity of this consequence, for my part I cannot; only, if Kings can discover it, it may be their wisdom hereafter to bethink themselves before they admit of the concurrence of their people either to the making or

executing laws; for if they do, good morrow to their majesty and sovereignty, as well as to their incontrolability and unaccountableness.

XXXIII.—10. From my saying that Numidicus was probably ordained a Presbyter before St Cyprian joined him to the Presbytery of Carthage, G[ilbert] R[ule] infers[1] thus:—"If Numidicus was ordained before, then he was also placed in Carthage before:" that is, if Numidicus was ordained before St Cyprian joined him to the Presbytery of Carthage, then he was also placed in Carthage before he was joined to the Presbytery of Carthage. Good! if G[ilbert] R[ule] was ordained a Presbyter before the year 1660, then was he a Presbyter of Edinburgh before the year 1660, as good.

XXXIV.—11. I had adduced the Testimony of the Roman Confessors who had forsaken Novatianus and returned to the unity of the Church, to prove that they owned Cornelius to be superior to his *clergy*; because they expressly distinguish between him and his clergy, in these words of their Epistle to St Cyprian,[2] "we are reconciled to Cornelius *our Bishop*, and to all the clergy." Consider now what advantage G[ilbert] R[ule] makes of this by his dexterity at drawing consequences:[3]—"As if he had designed to refute himself," says he, "he citeth a letter of these persons, shewing that they were reconciled to the Bishop and to the whole clergy; where is, then, the Bishop's *sole power* of reconciling penitents?" Now it is not his making me to plead for the Bishop's sole power of reconciling penitents, though, (as I have said, and shall have occasion to say again), I never pleaded for any such thing, but his accurate reasoning, that I take notice of. For why might not the Bishop have had the sole power of reconciling, *i. e.* of authoritatively and judicially absolving penitents, notwithstanding any thing contained in that Epistle? Can their saying that they had made their peace with the clergy hinder it? if so, then the people had their share of the authoritative reconciliation of penitents; for they say they made that peace "with the joy and good liking of all

[1] Sect. 45, p. 62.

[2] Cum Cornelio Episcopo *nostro* pariter et cum universo clero pacem fecisse. Ep. 53, p. 98.

[3] Sect. 47, p. 68.

the people,"[1] so that the power of reconciling was not *solely*, no, not in both Bishop and clergy. Nay, by this way of reasoning, the sole power of reconciling penitents was not in the Bishop, clergy, and people, all taken together, of any particular Church, but in all the Bishops, and all the clergy, and all the people of the Church Catholic. For here it lies; all those had a share of the power of reconciling, with whom the absolved were reconciled. Now it is certain, that by the principles of those times, whosoever was reconciled to his Bishop was reconciled to the whole Church Catholic. Once more—

XXXV.—12. I had said that St Cyprian, while in his retirement, had delegated Caldonius and Herculanus, two Bishops, to order some affairs relating to the Church of Carthage: Hear now how G[ilbert] R[ule] makes his advantage hereof.[2]—"If this discourse prove such a power of delegation, it will also prove such a power in one Bishop over another, which our author will not allow, &c" In short, as he reasons the matter, a Bishop's power to delegate another Bishop to order any matter for him, gives the delegating a power over the delegated, and by consequence, quite destroys the original equality of Bishops. How happy is that party that has such a master at reasoning for their champion. Only G[ilbert] R[ule]'s colleagues in Edinburgh, next time he goes to Court about the weighty matters of the Kirk, may do well to take heed that none of them receive a letter from him, desiring them to order any matters in his parish; for if they do, and do obey the desire of that letter, they have seen their last of Presbyterian parity: they have even given G[ilbert] R[ule] a power over them, and made him a Bishop. But is there no remedy? Courage brethren! G[ilbert] R[ule] may even delegate you for all that, and yet acquire no power over you; for he tells you in the very next words, "that sending a messenger to do for us, what we are restrained from doing, is not always an act of authority: one friend may send another, if he yield to it, as well as a master may send his servant." Now certainly this is very true in one sense, *i. e.* it is not indeed an act of authority over the person sent or delegated, and

[1] Cum gaudio etiam universæ Ecclesiæ, prona etiam omnium charitate. *Ibid.*

[2] Sect. 47, p. 69.

so the original equality of Bishops is wind tight and water tight, notwithstanding the delegation St Cyprian gave to Caldonius and Herculanus. But then it is as certainly false in another sense, (the only sense in which the truth of it could have been useful to G[ilbert] R[ule]), viz. that it is not always an act of authority over the Church, in which the matter or matters are to be ordered by virtue of that delegation.

XXXVI.—By this time the reader has got a full dozen of instances of G[ilbert] R[ule]'s abilities at reasoning. It had been a very easy task to have tripled the number; but I am not willing to turn the reader's stomach. These I have adduced may be sufficient for my purpose, which was to shew what little necessity G[ilbert] R[ule]'s abilities that way can lay on one to give him any laborious reply. Neither

XXXVII.—V. Has he shewn either such skill or accuracy, or ingenuity, in the matter of books or reading, as can infer any such necessity. Indeed, there is scarcely one author cited by him in all his book which might not afford reflections on some one or more of those his qualities. But it is not my purpose, on this consideration, to call him to an account for all his lame, or his impertinent or his wrested, or his false citations. That which I do now aim at is chiefly his skill in his accounts, his censures, and his recommendations of books. I shall afterwards prove, that notwithstanding all the noise he makes about Blondel, yet he has either never read him, or he has not understood him. But he seems as little acquainted with his other master, Salmasius, for he very learnedly makes two different books of Walo Messalinus, and Salmasius his book, "*de Episcopis et Presbyteris.*" Take it in his own words,[1] "he is full as unhappy [says he of me] in his next witness, Salmasius, who both in his book *de Episcopis et Presbyteris* is against this author, and in Walo Messalinus, that is commonly ascribed to him."

XXXVIII.—He is every whit as happy in his censures. Thus, he fairly calls in question the genuineness of Cornelius his Epistle [or rather Epistles] to Fabius of

[1] Sect. 13, p. 15.

Antioch, mentioned by Eusebius. I had cited Cornelius his authority in that Epistle for Exorcists and Acolyths, &c. and referred to Eusebius, lib. 6, c. 43. Now hear G[ilbert] R[ule][1]—"I find the Epistle of Cornelius," [says he] "in Eusebius, lib. 6, c. 42. He" [*i. e.* I] "calleth it 43. How genuine that Epistle of Cornelius is, or the account that Eusebius giveth of it, I shall not now enquire." Does not this plainly import that he had something to say against both the Epistle and Eusebius's account of it, if he had leisure for it? It was pity he wanted leisure to bless the world with such a new discovery, for I do verily believe he is the first man that has questioned that Epistle. Neither must I escape for saying it was cap. 43, though I am sure I cited according to the numbers of Stephanus and Valesius, who, I suppose, have given us the accuratest editions of Eusebius.

XXXIX. — And now that we have Eusebius before us, I hope it shall not be an unpardonable digression to take notice how G[ilbert] R[ule], in the last book he has published, his "Good Old Way Defended," has attempted to ruin for ever the credit of Eusebius's ecclesiastical history, and that by two arguments. One is, that Socrates testifieth of Eusebius's history, lib. 1, cap. 1—"That he took more care to praise the Emperor than to describe the acts of that time,"[2] which might, perhaps, have been deemed of some weight, if Socrates had not expressly told us that he meant this, not of Eusebius's ecclesiastical history but of his books of the Life of Constantine. The other argument is, that Eusebius citeth Sozomen, lib. 3, c. 20 (says G[ilbert] R[ule], 23, say I), who lived an hundred years after him. I know G[ilbert] R[ule] has been very heartily laughed at by many for using such an argument—an argument founded indeed on a most notorious and gross mistake; the mistake of taking Σωζομένος for the historian Sozomen, whereas Eusebius is only there giving the name of one of Clemens Alexandrinus's books, as is evident not only from that 23d chapter of lib. 3, but also from lib. 6, cap. 13—a book still extant, the whole title whereof is, "τίς ὁ Σωζομένος πλουσιος," *i. e.* "What rich man can be saved?" But I must be so just

[1] Sect. 13, p. 17.

[2] Good Old Way, p. 134.

to G[ilbert] R[ule] as to tell my countrymen who laugh at him on this occasion, that they ought not to make *him* the only butt of their laughter; for this blunder is not peculiar to him, neither might he have found it, only in Meredith Hanmers's old English translation (cited for it by G[ilbert] R[ule], in a letter to a friend, who had put him to it to account for his argument), or in a Latin translation, wherein, if we may believe the title-page, no meaner men than Musculus, Joachimus, Camerarius, Joannes Christophersonus, and Joannes Jacobus Grynæus, were concerned;[1] but likewise other three of our most renowned Scottish Presbyterians had it before him—Mr Andrew Melvin, Mr David Calderwood, and Mr Thomas Forrester. Melvin, in an admirable book, entitled, "Scoti του τύχοντος Paraclesis contra Danielis Tileni Silesii Parænesin ad Scotos Genevensis Disciplinæ Zelotas conscriptam," printed anno 1622, scourges poor Eusebius to purpose, cap. 30, sect. 5, and one of the lashes he gives him is this—"Citaturne ab Eusebio Sozomenus qui post Eusebium centum annos vixit?" *i. e.* "What, doth not Eusebius cite Sozomen, who lived an hundred years after Eusebius?" Calderwood also, in his "Altare Damascenum," having first rejected Eusebius's authority, as being an indiligent historian, as having many fabulous things in him, many false stories, many anathronisms, &c. at last, adds thus—"But let Eusebius be a witness beyond all exception, yet, without doubt, his history has been interpolated by some very unskilful impostor, for he mentions Sozomen, who was born an hundred years after him."[2] And as Melvin had for his author, Robert Parker, in his Second Book, "De Politeia Ecclesiastica," 273; so Mr Forrester, in his "Rectius Instruendum," p. 195, 196, has pretty faithfully translated Calderwood, and concludes the matter thus—"Admit Eusebius's testimony were above all exception, yet that his history hath been corrupted by some ignorant impostor, is demonstrated from this by Didoclave[3] (*i. e.* Calderwood), that he makes mention of Sozomen, who was born an hundred years thereafter." And the same Forrester, in his late book entitled—"The Hierarchical Bishop's Claim," &c.[4] insists

[1] Edit. Basil. An. 1587. [2] Alt. Dam. p. 119.

[3] [The assumed name under which Calderwood published Altare Damascenum.—E.] [4] Part I, p. 19.

over again on the same very argument. And now that I have named this book, I cannot forbear to say that it is one of the pleasantest I have seen, especially when the author humbles himself to consider any thing of antiquity. May I not digress so far as to give my reader a small specimen?

XL.—" The epistles of St Clement, of the first century," says Forrester, " are very pregnant against the Divine right of Prelacy, particularly his epistle to the *Philippians*,"[1] as if ever there had been such an epistle. " There are no parts of Hegesippus now extant."[2] What, not so much as one fragment in all Eusebius? or are all those fragments, forgeries foisted in, like Sozomen, by some ignorant impostor? Again, having affirmed that the primitive Bishops were no more than fixed moderators, " and this," says he, " was, as Ambrose phrases it, multorum sacerdotum judicio constitutum, or by the judgment and appointment of the Presbytery. ' Presbyteri,' saith he, (*i. e.* Ambrose), ' unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu collocatum Episcopum nominabant,' so that, in Ambrose's sense, he (who was called Bishop) had this prostasy, or new name, as their mouth and moderator."[3] Now, it is certain that the " Multorum sacerdotum judicio constitutum," is not Ambrose's, but Hilary's, in his Commentary on Eph. iv. and here most wretchedly misapplied by Mr Forrester, as will at first sight appear to any who considers the context. And the next Latin sentence—" Unum ex se electum," is neither Ambrose's nor Hilary's, but Jerome's, in his epistle to Evagrius. Again—" if he (Dr Scot) mean, that we hold that there was a formal general council decreeing this, as he with his fellow pleaders fasten this gloss upon that passage of Jerom—" Prospiciente concilio——' and ' Toto orbe decretum est——."[4] And again, " Jerom says, ' Prospiciente concilio et toto orbe decretum est——.' "[5] Now, that phrase, " Prospiciente concilio," though thus twice ascribed to Jerom, is yet none of Jerom's, but Hilary's, in his above cited commentary. Again, " As for Jerom's epistle ad Nepot, asserting that what Aaron and his sons were, that

[1] Part I, p. 19. [2] *Ibid.* p. 49. [3] *Ibid.* p. 52.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 55. [5] *Ibid.* p. 62.

are the Bishops and Presbyters——"[1] Jerom says so indeed, in his Epistle to Evagrius, but no such matter in his Epistle to Nepotianus. Once more—" Gratian," says he, " shews that Ecclesia habet Senatum Presbyterorum."[2] But they are Jerom's words, only cited by Gratian. Farther yet, " Cyprian, Ep. 6 and 28, professes he neither could nor would do any thing without the clergy."[3] But if there is any such thing either expressed or insinuated in any of all St Cyprian's Epistles, I am satisfied that Mr Forrester be reputed the learnedest man on earth. Nay, " Cyprian calls Presbyters his colleagues,"[4] which if he does so much as once in all his works, I am content that Presbyterian government prevail at all times, and in all places. Would you have more? The *tenth* book of Ruffinus his history is cited by him,[5] and yet he never wrote more than two. And " we must acknowledge," says he, " the late distinction of clergy and laity to be far remote from St John's time."[6] And yet Clemens Romanus, who died many years before St John, has it more expressly (not indeed in any Epistle to the *Philippians*, but) in his genuine Epistle to the Corinthians.[7] These instances may serve for a proof of this author's good acquaintance with the Ancients. And yet, though it is plain he has never read one of them, (for who could have blundered so that had so much as seen them)? he talks as confidently about them as if he had them all by heart. Return we now to G[ilbert] R[ule].

XLI.—He gives another good instance of his critical skill in Clemens Romanus his first Epistle to the Corinthians.[8] I had adduced a testimony from it; and G[ilbert] R[ule] returns two answers. The first may be afterwards considered; it is the second I am concerned about at present. " Our author may know," says he, " that that and others of the epistles that go under Clement's name, are rejected as none of his by learned men, and on solid grounds." Now, to let alone the solid grounds, I would only gladly know the names of those learned men who rejected that Epistle to the Corinthians, since it was first published by our learned

[1] P. 59. [2] *Ibid.* p. 90. [3] *Ibid.* p. 90.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 98. [5] *Ibid.* p. 111. [6] *Ibid.* p. 52.
[7] *Vide* Clementis Epistolam, Sect. 40, in Cotelerii Bibliotheca.
[8] Sect. 34, p. 45.

countryman, Patrick Young, anno 1633. Sure I am, Blondel,[1] Salmasius,[2] Rivetus,[3] Smectymnuus,[4] the Provincial Assembly of London,[5] the divines at Newport,[6] Ludovicus Cappellus,[7] Joannes Dallæus,[8] Mr Baxter,[9] Dr Owen,[10] Johannes Hoornbeek,[11] the author of the "Case of Accommodation," &c.,[12] the author of the "Apologia pro Ministris Vulgo Dictis Non Confirmistis,"[13] the author of the "Apologia pro Epistola ad Renatum Veridæum."[14] Nay, even Mr Jamison,[15] and Mr Forrester,[16] and I cannot tell how many more of G[ilbert] R[ule]'s friends, do all allow it to be genuine. Most of them give it its due praises. Nor is there any monument of antiquity on which they lay more of the stress of their cause, though without reason, than this epistle. So that the reader may judge whether it was with or without good acquaintance of this Epistle that G[ilbert] R[ule] talked so about it. But,

XLII.—Of all the attempts he has made, that on St Cyprian is the pleasantest. He had a little entangled himself in so resolutely appealing to the Cyprianic Principles, and an escape was to be made; and all other ways being blocked up, he was even forced to venture through St Cyprian's sides. He does not indeed in plain and direct terms call in question the authority of St Cyprian's writings. It had been a little too shameless, first to have appealed to St

[1] Pref. ad apolog. pro. sent. Hieron. p. 5, 6, 25, 40, &c. et in ipso opere centies.

[2] Walo Mess. p. 60, 88, 161, 196, 212, 231, 248, 270, 382, 396, et in apparatu ad libros de primatu Papæ, p. 15, 22, 42, 48, 49, 50, 51, 56, 76, 255.

[3] Critic Sacr. Lib. i. c. 8.

[4] In their Vindication, p. 79.

[5] Append. ad jus divin. minist. Evangel, p. 104.

[6] In their first Paper.

[7] Thes. Salmur, Part 3, Disp. 22, Sect. 40.

[8] De confirmatione, &c. Lib. 2, cap. 2, p. 115. Et de scriptis quæ sub Dyonisii, &c. et Ignatii nominibus circumferuntur, lib. 1, cap. 30, p. 168. Lib. 2, cap. 26, p. 398.

[9] First Disputation of Church Government, p. 67, &c.

[10] Review of the True Nature of Schism, Oxford, An. 1657, p. 72, 74.

[11] Epist. de Independentismo, p. 68, 112.

[12] P. 26. [13] P. 33. [14] P. 74.

[15] Nazianzeni Querela, Part. 2, p. 114, 191.

[16] Hierarchical Bishop's Claim, &c. Part 1, p. 19, &c. *Licet satis ridicule.*

Cyprian, and then to come off with saying that St Cyprian's works are not genuine. But he has done it really more ways than one. He tells us that St Cyprian's "authority is insufficient to prove a divine truth." Be it so.[1] But did not you appeal to him? and will common sense admit of such a defence, an appeal once being made? Again, "I insist not," says he, "on the suspicion that St Cyprian's Epistles are corrupted," &c.[2] When corrupted, Sir? I hope not since you made your appeal; and if before, why did you make it? Nay, there is a third way he has fallen on to make his escape by; which is by telling in effect, that St Cyprian's *meaning* is not to be taken from St Cyprian's *words*. This he has twenty times over. What can be either more ingenious or more ingenuous than such attempts? Such is G[ilbert] R[ule]'s skill in censuring of books. I come now to

XLIII.—His recommendations. Two books he has most strenuously recommended.[3] "I desire the reader, who can," "says he, "for farther satisfaction, (in the controversy between the Prelatists and Presbyterians), would read Paul Bayn's 'Diocesan's Trial,' and Mr Peregrine's 'Letters Patents for Presbytery,' they have somewhat that is singular on this subject." I confess I had no small curiosity to see two books which were so effectually recommended by G[ilbert] R[ule]. But I cannot tell with what difficulty it was that I got a sight of them. 'Tis a fault they are not reprinted. I think G[ilbert] R[ule]'s zeal should have obliged him to represent a matter of such consequence to the General Assembly. But have they somewhat singular indeed? Yes, they have as much as makes it singularly pleasant that they have been so zealously recommended. For

XLIV.—Paul Baynes is indeed all over Independent. He is not only still reckoned and cited for one by Hoornbeck, in his long epistle "De Independentismo;"[4] by Dr Ames in his preface to Mr Bayne's book, as Hoornbeck understands him;[5] and by Beverley, as cited by the same Hoornbeck.[6] But it is most evident from his book, the same very book which G[ilbert] R[ule] has recommended so earnestly. For Mr Baynes states his first question in these very terms—

[1] Pref. [2] *Ibid.* [3] Sect. 38, p. 52.
[4] P. 8, 45, 60, 70, 83, 116. [5] P. 8. [6] P. 83.

"Whether Christ did institute, or his Apostles frame, any diocesan form of Churches, or parishional only?" And having first mustered the arguments insisted on by the advocates for diocesan churches, he makes his transition to his arguments for his own side in these words:—"Now we must muster those forces which oppose these diocesan churches, allowing only such Churches to be instituted of Christ which may *meet in one congregation* ordinarily.[1] And again, "That wherein we contradict one another is, we affirm that no such *head* Church was ordained, either virtually or actually, but that all Churches were *singular congregations, equal, independent* each of other in regard of subjection."[2] Indeed all his arguments, p. 4, 5, 6, do equally impugn classical, provincial, and national, as well as Episcopal diocesan churches. Nay, it is the main design of his whole book to establish churches only congregational.[3] What can be more plain Independent reasoning than that which he has p. 9? The sum is this: "God has not set any local bounds to churches in the New Testament—ecclesiastical jurisdiction doth *respicere subditos* only *per se*, not *terminos locales*, &c." which is notoriously a fundamental principle of Independency—the principle on which they proceeded in their collections of churches out of other Churches. And again, he affirms "that ministers are independent on one another in the use and exercise of their calling; and that the people, or the Church collective, the Christians of a single independent congregation, can set over themselves a pastor or a bishop, and they can depose him." This he pleads for with all his might.[4] In short, he is more expressly Independent than Mr Clarkson himself.[5] His book has the same design with Clarkson's, viz. to maintain that all primitive Churches were only congregational. He has paved the way to Clarkson, for avoiding the dint of an argument as much insisted on by all true Presbyterians, by Rutherford himself, by the Westminster Assembly itself against the Congregational men, as by any

[1] P. 4. [2] P. 13. [3] See p. 35, 47, 71, 75, 77.
[4] P. 88, 89.
[5] [A nonconformist divine, born in 1622. He was the author of several controversial treatises.—E.]

Prelatist upon any occasion; namely, the "argument that all the Christians in Jerusalem made but one Church, and yet there were more Christians in that than could meet together in one ordinary assembly for worship, &c." He has paved the way, I say, to Clarkson, by answering, "that it was by accident of a circumstance, happily of the Passover, that so many Christians were at Jerusalem when Paul came to it," Acts 21.[1] 'Tis true, indeed, Clarkson has a little corrected the evasion; he saw it was ridiculous to make them so numerous at that time, upon the account of the *Passover*; therefore he betakes himself to Pentecost, which yet, when duly sifted, can stand him in as little stead. But that is not my present business. It is enough if Baynes and Clarkson agree in design; and indeed Baynes his zeal has prompted him to bolder strokes than Clarkson had courage for. For instance, rather than grant there were more than one congregation in Rome in Cornelius's time, he adventures to maintain that 20,000 people might make but "one congregation,"[2] which cannot but seem ridiculous to any who considers the circumstances of the Church in those times. And now let the reader judge with what reason G[ilbert] R[ule] could so heartily recommend Paul Bayn's Book, and withal say as he has said,[3] viz:—"that he does not join with Clarkson in the whole design of his Book." Let him judge with what reason G[ilbert] R[ule], a zealous Presbyterian, could recommend to his readers a book which was so much designed for establishing Independency, and overthrowing the scheme of Presbytery as much as Diocesan Episcopacy.

XLV.—But has he nothing singular against Diocesan Episcopacy? Nothing, so far as I have observed. I have indeed observed him (I shall not say singularly, but I will say) very signally weak in his reasonings on divers questions. I shall only entertain the reader with one or two for a taste. He reasons against a diocesan church—any Church that is extended beyond a single congregation—in these very words:[4]—"Those Churches which Christ did ordain, and the Apostles plant, might ordinarily assemble to the ordinances for worship; but a diocesan church cannot ordinarily as-

[1] P. 4, 5. [2] P. 20. [3] Sect. 19, p. 24. [4] P. 8, 9.

semble. *Ergo*, if any man distinguish the assumption, and consider a diocesan as she is in her parts, or as she is a totum, standing of her parts now collected together, and say she may, and doth meet and communicate, and edify herself in the first respect, I answer, this is nothing, and doth prove her to be nothing, as she is to be a diocesan church; *quia, quicquid est, agit secundum quod est.* If therefore a diocesan church were a real Church, she must have the effect of such a Church, to wit, assembling as she is diocesan. The synagogues through Israel met Sabbath by Sabbath, but were no national Church in this regard, that is to say, as it was a national Church, it had her national real meetings." Now, besides that all this reasoning is purely on the Independent principles, is it not plain that, if it proves any thing at all, it proves the impossibility of one Catholic Church, and by consequence robs us of one of the articles of our creed? Again, he reasons against James's being Bishop of Jerusalem to this purpose[1]—" That James, as an Apostle, was infallible; but had he been a Bishop, as such, he had been fallible; and so the people had been miserably intricated, because they should not have been able to discern whether what he taught, he taught as an infallible Apostle or as a fallible Bishop, and therefore he could not be Bishop of Jerusalem." Now I think one might almost venture to say that this is truly singular reasoning. Once more, what do you think of his fifth conclusion, and the reason of it, p. 77? I shall give it word for word.—" No order of ministers or servants can have majority of directive and corrective power over those who are in an inferior order of ministry and service. The reason is, because this exceedeth the bounds of ministerial power, and is a participation of that despotical power which is appropriate to the master of the family." Now let G[ilbert] R[ule] either make good reason of this, or reconcile it with the Presbyterian principles, if he can. Indeed

XLVI.—This recommended author more than once or twice directly contradicts G[ilbert] R[ule], *e. g.* he makes Evangelists (not subordinate to, but) collateral with the Apostles,[2] which, I am sure, G[ilbert] R[ule] has many times contradicted in his writings. Again, Baynes affirms,[3]

[1] P. 29. [2] P. 39. [3] P. 44.

"That Jerome's *toto orbe decretum est*, &c. imports no more than that it was took up in time for custom, through the world." But G[ilbert] R[ule], in his "Good Old Way Defended,"[1] has quite another notion of it. He calls it most absurd to say that *decretum* was *consuetudo ecclesiæ*. "A decree and a custom (says he) are two different things; nor was it ever heard of till this new master of words, A[lexander] M[onro] D.D. arose, that a decree was so called. Custom may follow on a decree, and the same thing may be decreed which hath accidentally obtained by custom; but to say a thing, (*e. g.* the setting up of Bishops as the remedy of schism), had its original from custom, and to mean it had its rise from a decree, is to speak nonsense." Once more, Mr Baynes makes the high priest among the Jews most plainly to have acted in parity with the other priests. He affirms that "the other priests were of the same order with the high priests, and that all the difference lay in degree of dignity." And he says expressly, that "the high priest had no majority of power, either directive or corrective, over others."[2] Now how is this consistent with G[ilbert] R[ule]'s assertion in his "Cyprianic Bishop Examined,"[3] viz., that "the high priest had universal supreme authority over the universal Church that then was?" It had been easy to have produced more of Paul Baynes's bad reasonings—more arguments of his being Independent, more of his triflings, more of his clashings even with G[ilbert] R[ule], &c. But the sample I have given, methinks, may give my reader occasion enough to judge whether G[ilbert] R[ule] is not singular for skill at recommending of books.

XLVII.—And yet Paul Baynes his "Diocesan Trial" is but a puny instance, when compared with Mr Peregrin's "Letters Patents," &c. For indeed if ever book was, it is a singular one; at least to my sense never book I have had the luck to see, no not "Rectius Instruendum," nor "Animadversions on Dr Stillingfleet's Irenicum," nor "The Rational Defence of Non Conformity," nor "The Good Old Way Defended," &c. has more singularities in it. Take this specimen. And

XLVIII.—I. With a singular boldness, he dedicates his book to God Almighty, and that, too, as if it had been

[1] Sect. 6, Sect. 7, p. 75. [2] P. 50. [3] Sect. 34, p. 43.

written by Divine Inspiration. Take it in his own words—"to whom then but to thee, O dreadful God! should I, thy poor servant, dedicate these, *his* (I think grammar would have required it should have been *my*) weak labours? For thou, O Lord God, best knowest the work that thou hast wrought in thine," &c. Sure I am, here is either singular boldness or singular familiarity.

XLIX.—2. Never man more singular for skill in antiquity; for though he adorns his title page with this glorious inscription,—"The Letters Patents of Presbytery; with the Plea and Fruits of the Prelacy, manifested out of the Scriptures, Fathers, Ecclesiastical History, Papists, and sundry other authors; by James Peregrin,"[1]—yet not one sentence in all the book worthy of such an hiatus; particularly, as for the Fathers, it does not appear from his book that he had ever read a line of them. His citations from them are few and trite: And his Margin confesses, he had them mostly from Bellarmin and Du Plesis.

L.—3. He is most singular in most of his reasonings, *e. g.* having cited St Paul's words to the pastors at Ephesus, Act 20, 28; he subjoins thus[1]—"whence it is infallibly plain, that Presbyterian government is the express ordinance of the Holy Ghost, who changeth not, and of whom Christ saith, "HE SHALL NOT SPEAK OF HIMSELF, FOR HE SHALL TAKE OF MINE, AND SHEW UNTO YOU. Now, CHRIST IS YESTERDAY, AND TO-DAY, AND THE SAME ALSO FOR EVER. This ordinance is therefore unutterable." I will not contend with G[ilbert] R[ule] about this reasoning. I do readily acknowledge it is very singular, yet not more than what he has page 10, where having cited 1 Tim. iv. 14, for the power of presbyters in ordinations, he subjoins, "Kemnitius therefore doth well observe here, that a Bishop may be ordained by presbyters; therefore, (says Peregrin), there is no difference between a Bishop and a presbyter." A sovereign may be inaugurated by his subjects, therefore there is no difference between a sovereign and a subject! Again,

LI.—4. Bellarmin, as cited by Peregrin, p. 12, had inferred from 1 Tim. v. 19, "that Timothy was a Bishop,

[1] [I have not been able to procure a copy of this work in order to verify the references.—E.]

the judge of presbyters, therefore their prince and superiour." "This cannot be true," says Peregrin, why? "because Christ saith to his disciples, 'YE KNOW THAT THE PRINCES OF THE GENTILES EXERCISE DOMINION OVER THEM,' &c. And St Peter saith to the presbyters—'TAKE THE OVERSIGHT OF THE FLOCK,'" &c. Now is not this singular reasoning even as you have it already? What then will you think of the singularity of it, when you consider that, with the same breath, he acknowledges that not Apostles only, but Evangelists were greater than presbyters. This, I say, he acknowledges not only page 13 and 15, but in that same very 12th page in which he reasons so against Bellarmin. And p. 16, we have the very cream of singularity, for there he tells us "that all who are against presbyterian ruling elders, 'RESIST THE ORDINANCE OF GOD,'" Rom. 13. Now if we may believe the Apostle there, "THEY THAT RESIST SHALL RECEIVE TO THEMSELVES DAMNATION." Give ear, O ye prelatists, O ye French Protestants, O thou Catholic Church, for full fifteen centuries consider the danger, the unavoidable danger of denying the divine institution of the holy order of ruling elders as contradistinct from preaching presbyters. For my part I never adverted to it before: Damnation! It is a pretty hard sentence.

LII.—5. Would the reader have any more of Mr Peregrin's singularities? Let him go on in that same sixteenth page, and he will find that the ten great persecutions were ended and over when one of the elders, Rev. 17, spake to St John. And he will find him, (p. 16 and 17), making a good argument for Presbyterian government, of the very single mention of an elder in that same Chapter. But if you consider Rev. xix. 4, 5, 6, you have perfect demonstration for it; so perfect that the conclusion is, "it is here predicted that prelacy must fall, and that all, as well high as low, should endeavour to know so much; that knowing it, when in prayer they say, "THY KINGDOM COME," (however it seems Peregrin was not against the Lord's prayer) in heart, they may both pray that God would send it (viz. the overthrow of Prelacy,) and use the best means they can to effect it." And p. 40, he affirms that the Council of Nice established the power and primacy of the Pope.

LIII.—6. Has the reader any more stomach for Mr

Peregrin's singularities? then let him turn to page 34, and he shall find a treasure of as singular something as ever he read in his life. Take it in the worthy author's own words. Having formed an objection against himself, viz. that Diocesan Bishops appeared very soon after the death of the Apostles, &c. he answers to it thus—"Bishops were then diocesan and provincial, rather *nomine quam re*, in name than in deed, exercising little power and authority over them (the Presbyters.) He (the Bishop) was not then come to his power and strength—was then little other than a Presbyter in matter of government.——He governed like them and with them. The Presbyters had their voices in councils, they neither were nor would be soon thrust out." How sorts this account with G[ilbert] R[ule's] already accounted for?[1] This by the way; come we now to the very kernel of Mr P.'s singularity. "So, for that time, they had still the essential parts of a true Church; at least, till such stains and blemishes grew greater, and the hierarchy exercised more authority over the Presbyters, and became the mint, defence, and authority of human invention, errour, and superstition, and to be made a mark of the true Church. Then the mystery of iniquity that had long wrought in that invention began to shew the fruits thereof." This I think may pass for an original singularity. But to go on, Mr Peregrin will needs have Prelacy to have introduced Popery; in which, I do confess, he is not singular. But then he does it by an argument which very well deserves to be so dubbed. "Grant," (says he, p. 34,) "that they may ordain diocesan Bishops, and that their ordinance is by a *divine instinct*, and of good authority; and it will follow that others afterwards may as well ordain the rest, (viz. Archbishops, Patriarchs, the Pope) and that their ordinance also is by *divine instinct*, and of good authority. And so indeed to ordain Cardinals, and as many upstart orders of priests and friars as are among the Papists. I might add setting up of images to be worshipped, and all other Popish tenets and customs, which have been authorised by Councils and Kings, if that were sufficient, as some think it is." But now it is time to have done with pleasant Mr Peregrin, and therefore only one singularity more, and good morrow to

[1] Sect. 6.

him till another occasion. You have in p. 12, where he cites Ovid, saying, "There be Clerks which possess more under poor Christ than erst they did under the rich devil."

LIV.—By this time the reader, I think, may competently judge of G[ilbert] R[ule's] skill in recommending of authors. I have been so careful about all I have said or cited from both his singular men, that I dare appeal to G[ilbert] R[ule] himself concerning my fidelity. I have no where found him commending or recommending Beza, Gersom Bucer, Blondel, Salmasius, Daille, or any other truly learned author with half the zeal. What can be the reason? I must let it alone, for I am not able to satisfy myself about it. However, I think, I may now fairly come to the conclusion I aimed at, namely, that whatever G[ilbert] R[ule's] skill may be in giving accounts, or censuring, or recommending of books, it is not such as can lay any considerable obligation on one to answer his "Cyprianic Bishop Examined." And sure I am, his skill in managing some controversies, to which yet he has applied himself very warmly, can as little make it necessary; as I shall shew in one instance, viz. the controversy about ruling elders, before I have done.[1] Now, I think, it is reasonable to give my reader an account of the motives which prevailed with me to be at so much pains, where there was so little real necessity. And here I am afraid I shall not give him so full satisfaction as he may expect; but such as I can, I shall give very frankly.

LV.—The reason which was offered to me by my friends to oblige me to reply to G[ilbert] R[ule], I must confess did at first sight seem to me to have a more natural and plain tendency towards dissuading me to undergo such a drudgery. It was that though my book did not need a vindication, yet it was not fit that G[ilbert] R[ule's should want an answer. A reason which, as I have said, seems rather to conclude for ease than toil; for silence rather than more laborious scribbling. For why should one be obliged to write vindications, as often as another shall have the heart to write to little or no purpose against him? and it adds not a little to the force of this reasoning, that such an one as G[ilbert] R[ule] is that other. G[ilbert] R[ule], I

[1] See chap. 8.

say, who in most of his writings, (for instances the last two I have seen, his "Appendix to the Cyprianic Bishop Examined," and his "Good Old Way Defended,") has given the world good ground to believe that he has, indeed, one fixed principle, which is to vindicate whatever he has once written, whether advisedly or rashly, whether with or without reason. G[ilbert] R[ule], who for anything I know, for anything that appears, will write anything rather than give over writing—G[ilbert] R[ule], with whom the having the last word seems in most cases to be the first reason of writing; yet after some more thinking, and some other importunities, I found myself inclined to alter, if not my opinion, at least my resolution, and once more to try if he is capable of conviction.

LVI.—Besides that G[ilbert] R[ule] as I have said, is one, if not the only stated authorized advocate for his party, so that to despise him, or neglect him, doth not precisely terminate on himself; besides this, I say, it seems of a long time to have been one of the resolved maxims, (shall I call it? or fixed humours) of the party, that whatever else they may bear with, yet they must not bear with an adversary's having the last word, and another, that whatsover book is written by any of them, whether well or ill, it matters not, if it be not answered, must therefore be engrossed into a certain canon they seem to have of books which they call unanswerable; and so must become a book of unquestionable authority with their credulous disciples? so far, that though you propose to them never so clear demonstrations of their errors, yet you must not prevail so long as they have to say that such a man has written such an unanswerable book, while, in the meantime, all the reason they have for saying so is, that perhaps nobody has been at the pains to give it a direct, particular, and formal answer, and perhaps even that too, for this very good reason, that it deserved none.

LVII.—Whoso has observed how familiar it is with them to have in their mouths "Altare Damascenum," "Vindiciæ Epistolæ Philadelphi,"[1] "The Canterburian's

[1] [These books were written by Calderwood under the name of "Dido-Clavius," in answer to Archbishop Spottiswoode.—E.]

Self-Conviction,"[1] "The Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland," "Durham on the Revelation," "Rectius Instruendum," and I do not know how many such books, cannot think that I am injurious to them in this matter. But I shall make sure work of it, by giving my reader a taste of those heights of assurance wherewith they use to refer to such books in their published writings. Thus,

LVIII.—The prefacer to that history which commonly goes under the name of Mr Calderwood's, says—"He needs say no more in the commendation of it than it was written by famous Mr David Calderwood, whose praise is in the Churches of Christ, as otherwise, so particularly upon the account of his being (but under another and borrowed name of Edvardus Didoclavius) the author of that very learned and elaborate treatise, entituled "Altare Damascenum," wherein he doth by Scripture, Reason, and Fathers, irrefragably and *unanswerably* (and indeed for any thing we know, says he, it hath not been *answered* to this day, nor belike will afterwards) demonstrate the iniquity of designing and endeavouring to model and conform the divinely simple worship, discipline, and government of the Church of Scotland to the pattern of the pompously prelatic and ceremonious Church of England."

LIX.—The author[2] of the "Defence of the Unlawfulness and Danger of Limited Episcopacy," published anno 1641, assures his reader[3] that "there are a number of passages of the Fathers for ruling elders in the book of Gersom Bucerus, which the boldest of the Prelatic party, for all their big words and exclamations in the ears of silly people, after twenty-two years advertisement, *durst* never so much as *offer* to *answer*. And what plebeian presbyterian, after this, was not bound to believe Bucer's book to be *unanswerable* at least, as to the point of ruling elders?

The reviewer[4] of Dr Bramhall's "Fair warning to take heed of the Scottish Discipline," affords us good store of such books; thus "Lysimachus Nicanor," and "Issachar's Burden"[5] "had an answer from Mr Baylie, which some years

[1] [Principal Baillie was the author of this.—E.]
[2] [Principal Baillie.—E.]
[3] P. 16, 17.
[4] [Principal Baillie.—E.]
[5] [These two last named books were written by Bishop Maxwell of

before" (the writing of this review) "was printed at London, Edinburgh, and Amsterdam," (three notable impressions, you see, in three notable cities,) "and all this without a rejoinder from any of the prelatic faction to that day."[1] Again, "Dr Laud stands convicted of Arminianism, Popery, and tyranny," (no doubt in the Canterburian's Self-Conviction,) "without an *answer*."[2] Yes! without an *answer*. For though that great man did more solidly subvert the very foundations of popery in his excellent account of his conference with Fisher than ever any Scottish Presbyterian has done; though he did most conscientiously purge himself of all inclinations to either popery or tyranny in his very last speech at his martyrdom, some years before this review was written, yet there was no stated and formal answer given to "The Canterburian's Self-Conviction," and therefore it was *unanswerable*.

LXI.—Hear him again. "None of the prelatic party has had the courage to offer one word of answer to the Scriptures and Fathers, which in great plenty Mr Parker and Mr Didoclave of old, and of late that miracle of learning, most noble Somais, and that magazine of antiquity, Mr Blondel, have printed against them."[3] It is true the book from which I cited these passages was written anno 1649, and Dr Hammond had not then published his Dissertations, in which he called Blondel, and sometimes Salmasius to an account; but then those Dissertations did not meddle with Parker and Didoclave, so that they do still continue of the number of *unanswerable* books. Once more,[4] "the warner (*i. e.* Dr Bramhall) would do well to consider and answer, after seven years' advice, Mr Baylie his parallel of the service (of the Church of England) with the missal and breviary, before he present the world with new parallels of the English Liturgy with the directories of the Reformed Churches." Is it not fairly imported in these words, "would

Ross, who was afterwards translated to Killala in Ireland. The former purported to be a congratulatory epistle from a Jesuit to a Covenanter, shewing the harmony between their Societies in doctrine and practice. The latter was intended to expose the arbitrary proceedings of the Covenanting party.—E.]

[1] Edit. Hague, 1661. Cap. 1, p. 2.
[2] Cap. 7, p. 47.
[3] Cap. 8, p. 54.
[4] Cap. 12, p. 74.

do well to consider and answer," that to answer Baylie's parallel was more than the Doctor was able to do? or, which is the same thing, that that parallel was unanswerable?

LXII.—I am unwilling to give my reader a surfeit of such stuff. I shall therefore mention only one book more before I come to G[ilbert] R[ule]. It is that which bears the name of *Rectius Instruendum*—a book not only frequently praised by that man of marvellous principles, the author of the "Hind Let Loose,"[1] but also lately placed by Mr Jamison, now one of the first-rate writers of the party, in his Canon of *unanswerable* Books, in the very first paragraph of his *Nazianzeni Querela*. Take his own words, "the purpose of our present discourse," says he, "is not directly that much tossed debate," (if an office in the Church for species or kind superior to that of dispensing the Word and Sacraments hath any footing or warrant in the Word of God?) "neither will this be judged necessary by any who call to mind that many treatises, disproving the Divine right of Episcopacy, as *Altare Damascenum* and *Rectius Instruendum*, have had so good success, that for ought I know, they stand entirely without any shadow of an answer." So says Mr Jamison; and yet I dare be bold to tell my reader, that he shall not find many indications of either great learning or good sense in this *Rectius Instruendum*. It is even much of a piece with its parent's other book, mentioned before.[2] But I may have occasion afterwards to give a specimen of it. All I have to say at present is, that I am not able to fancy to myself any shadow of a reason for which it should be deemed unanswerable, unless it be that the author against whom it was written lived some twelve or thirteen years after its publication, and never did it (that which indeed it deserved not) the worship of an answer. And so

LXIII.—I come to G[ilbert] R[ule], whose books if you read, you shall not only find him frequently referring you to Mr Gillespie's "Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland as an unanswerable book for ruling elders;" and the "Unlawfulness and Danger of Limited Episcopacy" as an unanswerable book against constant moderators, and I know not how many other such books, but you shall even

[1] [The well-known field-preacher, Alexander Shields.—E.]

[2] Sect. 40.

find him not unfrequently referring you to his own unanswered books. I have seen two of them, both written against the truly learned Dr Stillingfleet; one against his "Irenicum," the other against his "Unreasonableness of the Separation from the Church of England;" which books of G[ilbert] R[ule]'s, I am told, those of his party do very much admire and recommend; but, so far as I know, or can conjecture, for no other reason than that Dr Stillingfleet did never humble himself to reply to them, and I do verily believe, though he had lived Nestor's days, he never would. I am confident there had been no cause for it. One step nearer home.

LXIV.—When the excellent A[lexander] M[onro] D.D. in his "Enquiry into the New Opinions,"[1] &c. told G[ilbert] R[ule] that it was needless to cite particular testimonies from St Cyprian for the superiority of Bishops, G[ilbert] R[ule] tells him again, in his 'Good Old Way Defended,'[2] "That he had seen J[ohn] S[age's] Principles of the Cyprianic Age;" and he "refers him for satisfaction about Cyprian's opinion in point of Church government to the answer to that book, under the title of 'The Cyprianic Bishop Examined.'" Here (say those who are earnest to have me write), the matter is fairly brought to my door; here, (as they construct it), I have a fair provocation to re-enter the lists with him, and try whether his book does indeed give such satisfaction. If I do not write, people may—those of G[ilbert] R[ule]'s party will—be ready to conclude that it verily gives satisfaction about St Cyprian's opinion, as he calls it; and so the credit of "The Principles of the Cyprianic Age" shall be utterly blasted, and G[ilbert] R[ule]'s "Cyprianic Bishop Examined" shall stand fair for being shortly received into the Canon, the often mentioned canon of unanswered books. But—

LXV.—Besides this I have another and a weightier reason. G[ilbert] R[ule] has given me occasion to discourse some things which I hope may be useful to my countrymen. He has in a manner obliged me to give in full form the just and true state of the grand controversy between us and our brethren, which G[ilbert] R[ule]—as

[1] P. 63. [2] P. 64.

much and as frequently as he has written about it—seems never to have understood to this very day; and which, once fairly fixed, as I hope to fix it, may be useful, if not to end the controversy, yet at least to bring it nearer to a point, by shewing the true mark at which all pertinent arguments on either side must hereafter be levelled. He has likewise in some sort obliged me to shew how plainly and fully St Cyprian and his contemporaries have deposed for the Divine right of Episcopacy; or, in other words, how generally the divine institution of it was believed in St Cyprian's time, which I look upon as a point of no small moment. Other things of considerable usefulness, (at least so I design them), the reader may observe as he goes on. In short, my design is to try, if possibly I can put it beyond all hazard of ever being controverted for the future, that there was true, real, and proper Prelacy in St Cyprian's Age; which foundation being once made sure, I may afterwards have the easier work, (if God shall allow and assist me), to run it up to the true source—"The Apostolical Constitution of Church Government in those Churches whose constitution they lived to finish."

LXVI.—For these reasons I have resolved for once to keep G[ilbert] R[ule]'s book for some more time in a state of probation, and to endeavour to convince at least some readers, that though never book of G[ilbert] R[ule]'s should hereafter be answered, yet it will not necessarily follow that he writes none but unanswerable books.

LXVII.—I say some readers—I cannot undertake for all, particularly I do not expect to convince G[ilbert] R[ule] himself, he has indeed discouraged all such expectations. He has told A[lexander] M[onro] D. D.[1]—"That what I had brought from St Cyprian to prove that that Martyr asserted Episcopal jurisdiction, &c., he has endeavoured to answer. And —— if the Doctor would either reinforce the same citations, or bring new ones, he should not decline the debate with him." Now if G[ilbert] R[ule] had the courage to give such a plain and open defiance to one who had so notoriously given him the foil, is it to be

[1] Good Old Way.

thought, that so long as there is life in him, he will yield the controversy to such a one as I am?

> "Ante lupos rapient hædi, vituli ante leones—
> Et conversa retro rerum discordia gliscet
> Multa prius, fuerit"——[1]

But that shall never hereafter rob me of one minute's rest, for if G[ilbert] R[ule] will needs be so zealous for the last word, he shall have it, and reason too: for if what is digested in the following sheets shall not make him yield, all I have more to say is, (not that he must be obstinate, but) that I am not able to convince him.

LXVII.—Before I conclude this Chapter, let me advertise the reader that I am not to pursue G[ilbert] R[ule] foot for foot, as he uses to do his adversaries. Such a method can neither seem necessary nor useful to any man who has considered the specimen I have here given of his talents. And indeed it was for this end, (viz. that I might be allowed to take another method), that I give such a specimen. Neither will I digress to all the incidental controversies which he has either given me occasion or provocation to engage with him in. The establishment of a true and proper Episcopacy in the Cyprianic Age is all I aim at, or am willing at present to contend much for, and therefore it shall be all that I shall mainly endeavour. My scheme is this—

LXIX.—For proving that the Government of the Church was Episcopal in the days of St Cyprian, one argument I mentioned was, that so much was acknowledged by some of the greatest champions for Presbytery. This argument I shall now endeavour to make good; because, before, I did only name it. The rest of my arguments were taken from the principles of that age, as we have them recorded in the monuments of it. These I shall only maintain, by shewing the insufficiency of the main answers G[ilbert] R[ule] has been pleased to return to them. This done, I shall endeavour to purge myself and my friends of a most groundless scandal charged upon us by G[ilbert]

[1] [Diræ Valerii Catonis. Op: et Fragm. Vet. Poet. Lat. Tom. ii, p. 1588, Lond. 1713.—E.]

R[ule] and his party—the scandal of Popery. And last of all, because it was not done in my former book, and G[ilbert] R[ule] has given me a warm provocation to it, I shall endeavour to shew that it was the universal belief of the Christians of the Cyprianic Age that Episcopacy was of divine institution.

LXX.—I may, perhaps, insist more largely on these things than some readers would require; but I hope such as are judicious will incline to pardon such a fault, when they consider that my design is as much as I can to end controversies, and that controversies of this nature cannot be ended without full deductions. Besides, as I have said above,[1] to fix the Principles of the Cyprianic Age well, is to shorten the main controversy with our brethren, so that length here paves the way to brevity hereafter; and nothing so necessary as a foundation well laid for a solid superstructure. Only one thing I am farther to demand, and I have done; it is that G[ilbert] R[ule] (or who else soever of his party shall incline to give me a reply) may be pleased either to let my book alone, or make it their work not to nibble at incidental escapes (whereof perhaps I may be guilty), but to grapple with the main design of it. I mean let it be their work to shew that I have not sufficiently proved that there was proper Episcopacy in St Cyprian's time. Nothing less can serve the Presbyterian cause. It can do it no substantial service to prove that I (for what am I) have sometimes mistaken the meaning of a citation, or have failed in point of reasoning, so long as this proposition stands firm—"THAT IN ST CYPRIAN'S TIME THERE WAS A PROPER PRELATION OF A BISHOP OVER PRESBYTERS."

[1] Chap. 1, sect. 59.

CHAP. III.

EPISCOPACY ACKNOWLEDGED BY MANY LEARNED PRESBYTERIANS TO HAVE BEEN IN THE CHURCH IN ST CYPRIAN'S TIME.

SECT. I. THE first argument I adduced to prove that there was real Prelacy in St Cyprian's time, was that generally the great champions for Presbytery, such as Chamier, Blondel, Salmasius,[1] the Provincial Assembly[2] of London, &c. do ingenuously acknowledge that long before St Cyprian's time such prelacy was in the Church. This I called a shrewd presumption against G[ilbert] R[ule], and he seems to have been sensible of the force of it; for though I did but transiently mention it, only naming the aforesaid authors, without producing their testimonies, yet G[ilbert] R[ule] turns all tempest; nor have I observed fairer passions awakened in him than on this occasion. He tells me "he knows not what my, &c. may contain in its vast belly, but he is not afraid of them I mentioned."[3] He refers to the reader to judge with what *brow* I could bring Chamier for my voucher, who so flatly contradicted the whole of my book,[4] that either I had not read Blondel, but cited him at adventure, or I have a confidence to assert what I will, though absurd and unaccountable.[5] That I am fully as unhappy in Salma-

[1] [These were French Protestants, who managed the argument on their side with considerable learning and ingenuity.—E.]

[2] [This meeting was convened by the authority of Parliament after the Grand Rebellion, and consisted of those clergymen who had forsaken the Church in the hour of her depression and trial, and joined the ranks of her bitterest enemies. It put forth a plea for Puritanism, and a defence of the unauthorised ordinations, which had taken place after the overthrow of the Church, under the titles of "Jus Divini Regiminis Ecclesiastici" and "Jus Divinum Ministerii Anglicani."—*Vide infra*, Chap. 35. —E.]

[3] Sect. 11, p. 12. [4] Sect. 11, p. 13. [5] Sect. 12, p. 15.

sius,[1] and as for the Provincial Assembly of London, he knows not what book I meant, neither do I know myself, for what appeareth.[2] And after he has talked what he thought fit concerning each of those authors, he tells his reader "that he shall not hope to say anything that is convincing, if what he has brought do not persuade the unbiassed reader that those famous presbyterians have the same sentiments of the judgment of the first antiquity about the power of presbyters that he expressed in the place I made such a pother about,"[3] that is, (if it be to the purpose), that the aforesaid authors did not acknowledge that there was real prelacy in St Cyprian's time. Now, if I shall demonstrate to the conviction even of the most obstinate, that I had reason to cite those authors as having made such acknowledgments, and if I shall make it appear that it was not without ground that I added the &c., I think I may leave it to the reader to judge whether G[ilbert] R[ule] had ground for so much vapouring.

II.—Chamier was the first I named, and that which gave me *brow* to do it was, that Bellarmin having adduced the testimonies of Ignatius, Irenæus, and Tertullian (all three much elder than St Cyprian) for the Divine right of Episcopacy, Chamier answers, "that their testimonies do not conclude any such Divine right; they do not shew that there was no period of time in which parity obtained; they only prove that *inequality* or imparity is most ancient, and next neighbour to the times of the Apostles," which he readily grants. "For Jerom," says he, "tells that *imparity* prevailed at Alexandria in the days of Heraclas and Dionysius, thereby teaching that it was most ancient, for those lived about the year 140 and downward; and the Church of Alexandria was the last which admitted of that innovation, which therefore we may conjecture to have begun before the end of the first century." If my translation does not please G[ilbert] R[ule], he has Chamier's words faithfully transcribed on the margin.[4] And does not

[1] Sect. 13, p. 15. [2] Sect. 13, p. 16. [3] Sect. 13, p. 16.

[4] Respondeo, horum authoritates nihil efficere. Ratio, quia non ostendunt nullum unquam tempus extitisse, cum essent Episcopi pares Presbyteris; sed tantum *inæqualitatem* esse vetustissimam, ac vicinam Apostolorum temporibus: quod nos ultro fatemur. Nam Hieronymus, cum docet eam inæqualitatem invaluisse apud Alexandrinos, temporibus Heraclæ et Dionysii, satis disertè docet antiquissimam eam fuisse. Nam ii vixerunt circa

Chamier here fairly allow Episcopacy to have obtained about one hundred and fifty years before St Cyprian was Bishop of Carthage?

III.—But this *inequality*, acknowledged by Chamier to have so soon obtained, was only an *inequality* of dignity, a priority of order, not of jurisdiction. So it is said by G[ilbert] R[ule],[1] but purely at random, 1. Nothing can be plainer than that Chamier allows an *inequality of power*, a *priority of jurisdiction*, to have commenced from the very time of the *innovation*, as he calls it. "I do not deny," says he, "that Bishops got a *new power* and a *new jurisdiction*, for otherwise their Episcopacy had been but a mere title; for so long as one was only a Presbyter, it is not likely that he had any jurisdiction over either his colleagues or the whole Church; he got that only, then, when he became *First* or *Bishop*."[2] This is more than enough to discuss all that G[ilbert] R[ule] has said; but it is not all I have to say, for

IV.—2. Chamier plainly talks of an "*innovation* which was made after the times of the Apostles;" by necessary consequence, it could not be purely an imparity of dignity, or a priority of order which he meant, unless G[ilbert] R[ule] will affirm that Chamier did not understand the true Presbyterian principles, by which a priority of order and dignity is as ancient as Presbyteries themselves, or, which is all one, as ancient as moderators, without whom Presbyteries never were, never could be.

V.—This that the Episcopacy introduced so soon after the Apostles was an *innovation*—a recession from the order which obtained so long as the Apostles lived; and withal that moderators (who, as such, have still a priority of order and dignity) were coeval with Presbyteries. This, I say, is a consideration of so great weight, that when it is adverted

annum 140 et quod excurrit, et tamen sic designatur Ecclesia, quæ omnium postrema eam *innovationem* admiserit; quam propterea conjicere licet factam, aut nondum elapso, aut vix elapso primo seculo. Tom. 2, lib. 10, cap. 6, sect. 24.

[1] Sect. 11, p. 13.

[2] Accipere tamen novam potestatem jurisdictionemque non iverim inficias: ut ne esset Episcopatus, merus titulus: ac sanè cum quis esset tantùm Presbyter, non fit verisimile ullam habuisse in suos Collegas aut in universam Ecclesiam, jurisdictionem; sed tantùm cum fiebat primus, *i. e.* Episcopus. Tom. 2, lib. 10, c. 5, sect. 10.

to, it must needs shew the impertinency of that distinction between priority of dignity or order, and priority of power or jurisdiction, in most cases in which it is made use of by G[ilbert] R[ule] and his brethren; for how could it be an innovation? How a recession from the original order, if nothing more was conferred on Bishops or moderators than that which they had ever been in possession of from the very first institution of Presbyteries? This, I say over again, is of great weight and consequence, and I require G[ilbert] R[ule] and his brethren hereafter to remember it, as that which makes the aforesaid distinction ridiculous in most cases. But is it indeed a Presbyterian principle, that moderators are as old as Presbyteries? If any man doubts of it, let him have recourse to the margin for satisfaction.[1]

[1] Quod duodecim (Apostoli) unum habuerint inter se qui omnes regeret, nihil mirum. Hoc enim fert natura, hoc hominum ingenium postulat, ut in quovis cœtu, etiamsi æquales sint omnes potestate, unus tamen sit veluti, moderator, in quem alii respiciant. Nulla est curia sine consule; nullus consessus judicum sine prætore, seu quæstore; Collegium nullum sine præfecto; nulla sine magistro societas. Calv. Instit. lib. 4, cap. 6, sect. 8.

Essentiale fuit —— quod ex Dei ordinatione perpetua necesse fuit, est, et erit, ut in Presbyterio quispiam et loco et dignitate primus, actioni gubernandæ præsit, cum eo, quod ipsi divinitus attributum est, jure. Beza contra Sarav. apud Sarav. p. 244.

Natura sola duce docemur, ut omni parium cœtui præsideat unus aliquis: in imparibus, summus. Sic Diocesani Episcopi, cæteris Episcopis longè impares quia superiores, naturæ lumine, presidentiam obtinent, idque sine electione. And. Melvinus contra Tilenum, cap. 30, sect. 1. And, Natura, Dei ipsius instinctu, ordinis in omni cœtu necessitatem nos docet, &c. cap. 24, sect. 6. *Vide* etiam, cap. 16, sect. 28, (26 ?)—E.]

Cum omnia communi Presbyterorum consilio gerebantur aureo illo Apostolorum sæculo, ordinis tamen causa aliquis semper præfuit. Didoclavius, Alt. Damas. p. 301.

Essentiale nobis est, quod ex Dei institutione nunquam abroganda, necessarium semper fuit, semperque futurum est. Cujusmodi est, quod in Presbyterio quispiam, et consessus et sermonis faciendi πρωτομίᾳ primus, actioni moderandæ præesse debeat, &c. Gersom Bucerus, de Gubernatione Ecclesiæ, Επισκεψις 80, p. 308. Et "essentiale ac necessarium est in Ecclesiæ politia, ut Presbyteri communi consilio gubernationi vacent, et in eadem unus του πρωτοστατους partibus fungatur."—Επισκεψις 111, p. 411; *vide* plura. p. 19, 20, 253, 254, 301, 428, 580, 589, &c.

Collegium, *i. e.* ordinatus ratione utentium cœtus, sine ordine nec institui, nec conservari, nec agere, nec agi, (amplius dicam) nec cogitari posset; Blondellus Apol. pro sent. Hieron. p. 52, while discoursing of the necessity of a moderator, &c.

Partem unam veluti seponi debere, penes quam sit totius congregationis regimen, et ipsa rerum natura vult, et exempla suadent omnium talium congregationum. Natura rerum primum. Quî enim vel multorum suf-

VI. But does not Chamier say—"There was no domination allowed in the Church?" Does he not prove that "the government of the several Churches of old was aristocratical?" Does he not affirm that "Bishops were not monarchs, but chosen princes,"[1] &c.? Yes, he says so; what then? will it hence follow that he made Bishops and Presbyters to have acted in parity, ever after the distinction of their offices? To say so is inconsistent with what I have already cited from him.[2] As to the point of aristocracy, he himself most plainly unriddles the matter, by giving us to under-

fragia commode colligi, vel loquendi ac tacendi vices convenienter assignari, vel stata conveniendi tempora condici denique possent, nisi unus aliquis in cœtu emineret cui universa ista moderatio committeretur? &c. Amyraldus Th[eses] Salm[urenses], part 3, disp. 38, [de Ratione convocandorum conciliorum, sect. 70.—E.]

Paria habet Lud. Capellus, *ibid.* part 3, dis. 22, [De Episcopi et Presbyteri discrimine.—E.] sect. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. [Theses Theologicæ in Academiâ Salmurensi variis temporibus disputatæ sub præsidio D. D. Virorum S. Theologiæ Professorum. Lud. Cappelli, Mos. Amyraldi, Salmurii, 1651.—E.]

Johannes Hoornbeek (Dissert. de Episcopatu) non solum, pro necessitate ordinis in conventibus et gerendis negotiis moderatorem requiri ait, p. 29, 30. Verum etiam, p. 40, hæc illius verba sunt, "certe in Collegiis, si habentur' Ευσχημόνως et κατὰ τάξιν, præsidem esse aut constitui oportet."—Imo hoc authore teste, hæc omnium Ecclesiarum, confessionem Helveticam agnoscentium, fides; ex ea enim confessione ille, hæc p. 58. "Interea propter ordinem servandum, unus aut certus aliquis ministrorum, cœtum convocavit, et in cœtu res consultandas proposuit, sententias item aliorum collegit, denique ne qua oriretur confusio, pro virili cavit. Sic legitur fecisse in Actis Apostolorum S. Petrus." Confes. Helvet. cap. 18.

Quia vero in omni cœtu, ut vitetur confusio, necesse est dari ordinem aliquem inter ejus membra, ideo inter presbyteros dabatur primus aliquis, &c. Turretinus Inst. Theol. Elenct. part 3, loc. 18, quest. 21, sect. 13.

It were easy to multiply testimonies to this purpose, but I shall only adduce two others to complete the dozen

Mr Forrester in his Hierarchical Bishop's Claim, part 1, p. 54, thus, "as to the office of a president or moderator, whose work is to be the mouth of the meeting, to gather the votes and moderate the procedures, we hold that the very nature of all government essentially requires this, and consequently Church Government; and that this was always and necessarily practised, as in all Church Government, so, since the beginning, and is exemplified in that first Christian Council, Act 15," &c.

And even G[ilbert] R[ule] himself is as positive as any man; for he tells us, (True Representation of Presbyterian Government, prop. 14), "that it is one of the dictates of natural reason (which is also a beam of Divine light), that one preside in all Church meetings; and it is as unreasonable to require positive assertions of Scripture to warrant this, as to call us to bring texts to prove that we should come to the public assemblies clothed and not naked," &c.

[1] Cyp. Bishop Ex. sect. 11, p. 13. [2] Sect. 3.

stand that by aristocratical government he means no more than that Bishops were not absolute and arbitrary lords, and that Presbyters were not excluded from all share of the government.[1] But how far is this from importing that they acted in parity with their Bishops? In short,

VII.—An easy composition of a little skill in Latin, and a proportionable dose of ingenuity, had prevented all such feeble reasonings. For it is plain that Chamier meant the very same thing when he used the word *monarcha*, that he meant when he used the word *dominus;* that is, he never intended by either to exclude imparity between Bishops and Presbyters. He intended only the exclusion of absolute and unlimited power—of despotic power, as they call it—of such power as the *domini* among the Romans had over their *servi*. This I desire G[ilbert] R[ule] and all his brethren hereafter to take notice of; and to remember that when they use the phrase of "Church Domination," to bring an odium upon the government of Bishops (which phrase G[ilbert] R[ule] has very frequently in his writings —eight or nine times in his Cyprianic Bishop examined)[2] they must be either very disingenuous, or very ignorant of the proper import of such a phrase; for I do tell them over again, that they may the better mind it, that in the propriety of the Latin tongue, the word *dominus* signifies an absolute lord or master of slaves, and the word *dominatio* imports despotic power, the power that such lords had over their slaves. By consequence, such terms cannot, without manifest absurdity, be applied to Christian Bishops, at least so long as they keep within the bounds which the laws of God and his Church have prescribed to them. That such are the true, genuine, proper significations of these words, G[ilbert] R[ule] if he pleases, may learn from the margin.[3]

[1] Ab initio eundem fuisse ordinem; sed postea mutatum, et sic tamen mutatum, ut non imponeretur reliquis Presbyteris *Dominus;* sed duntaxat Εὐταξίας gratiâ, unus reliquis præeset, ut tamen communi consilio omnes Ecclesiam administrarent, quod est aristocraticum, Tom. 2, lib. 10. [cap. 5, sect. 20.—E.]

[2] P. 11, 12, 13, 36, 47, 78, 92, 94.

[3] Apparet *servum* hunc esse *domini* pauperis miserique—Terent Eunuch. A. 3, S. 2, L. 33. Nam is mihi profecto est *servus* spectatus satis, cui *dominus* curæ est. Adelph. A. 5, S. 6, L. 5, 6, and Adelph. A. 1, S. 1, L. 49, 50, 51. He manifestly distinguishes between a *dominus* and a *pater*, whom yet, I hope, G[ilbert] R[ule] will not deny to be superior, even in power,

VIII.—Blondel is the next I named—how G[ilbert]

to his children. "Hoc patrium est, potius consuefacere filium, sua sponte recte facere, quam alieno metu. Hoc *pater* ac *dominus* interest."

"*Servi* ære parati imperia injusta Dominorum non perferunt," says Memmius apud Salust. Bel. Jugurth. p. 261. Edit. Lugd. Bat. 1654. [Delph. Class, Regent's Ed. Jug. cap. 31.—E.] And Marius (*ibid.* p. 344) makes a mighty difference between a General —— of an army and a Lord, though, if I mistake not, it is not necessary that a General act in parity with his inferior officers. "Namque cum tute per mollitiem agas, exercitum supplicio cogere, hoc est *dominum*, non *imperatorem* esse." [Reg. Ed. cap. 85.—E.] And Lepidus (*ibid.* inter fragm. p. 443) as plainly distinguishes between *dominus* and *princeps*. "Mihi quidem satis spectatum est, Pompeium, tantæ gloriæ adolescentem, malle *Principem* volentibus vobis esse quam illis *dominationis* socium." [Reg. Ed. lib. 3, F. 307.—E.]

Curtius (lib. 8, cap. 7,) brings in Hermolaus discoursing thus to Alexander,—"occidendi te consilium inivimus, quia non ut ingenuis imperare cæpisti, sed quasi in *mancipia dominaris*." And after Alexander's death, (lib. 10, cap. 5), "Persæ, 'justissimum et mittissimum *dominum*,' Macedones, 'optimum et fortissimum *regem*' invocantes, certamen quoddam mœroris edebant.

"Gracchus profugiens, (Vell. Paterc. edit. Antwerp, 1627, p. 25,) cum jam comprehenderetur ab iis quos opimius miserat, cervicem Euporo *servo* præbuit, qui non segnius se ipse interemit quam *domino* succurrerat." And, p. 49, "Aperte deinde Antonii ac Dolabellæ consulum ad nefandam *dominationem* erupit furor." And "Torpebat oppressa *dominatione* Antonii civitas."

Cæsar also still uses the word in the same sense, thus—De Bello Gall. lib. 6, p. 224. Edit. Amstelodami, 1661. [Reg. Ed. lib. 6, 13.—E.] "In omni Gallia eorum hominum qui aliquo sunt numero atque honore, genera sunt duo: nam plebs pœne *servorum* habetur loco ——. Plerique cum aut ære alieno aut magnitudine tributorum, aut injuria potentiorum premuntur, sese in *servitutem* dicant nobilibus; in hos eadem omnia sunt jura, quæ *dominis* in *servos*."

Cicero affords plenty of testimonies to this purpose. *Vide* Orat. secundam pro Sexto Roscio Amerino, sect. 120. Epist. Famil. lib. 10, Ep. 31, lib. 12, Ep. 3. Tuscu. quest. lib. 3, sect. 41. It is a notable passage which we have in an epistle written by Brutus to Alticus (inter Ciceronis Epistolas ad Brutum, lib. 2,) where, writing concerning Antonius his attempting to raise himself to an absolute power; he thus—'Quin cum ipsa re bellum geram, hoc est cum regno, et imperiis extraordinariis, et *dominatione*, et potentia, quæ supra leges se esse velit, nulla erit tam bona conditio *serviendi*, qua deterrear, quamvis sit vir bonus, ut scribis, Antonius: quod ego, nunquam existimavi. Sed *dominum* ne *parentem* quidem majores nostri voluerunt esse.' To cut short, for it would be endless to cite all authors, which might easily be done.

It is observable that Augustus, Tiberius, Trajanus, Alexander Severus, all the good or wise or cunning Roman Emperors did still refuse the title of *dominus*. None took it kindly from their greatest parasites, but such monsters as Caligula, or Nero, or Domitian, or Diocletian. "*domini* appellationem, ut maledictum et opprobrium, semper exhorruit," (says Suetonius of Augustus, cap. 53, and he goes on), "Cum, spectante eo ludos, pronunciatum esset in mimo, '*O dominum* æquum et bonum,' et universi,

R[ule] has treated me for naming him, I have already ac-

quasi de ipso dictum, exultantes comprobassent; et statim manu vultuque indecoras adulationes repressit, et insequente die gravissimo corripuit edicto, *dominumque* se posthac appellari, ne a liberis quidem aut nepotibus suis, vel serio vel joco, passus est."

"*Dominus*" appellatus (Tiberius) a quodam, denuntiavit, ne se amplius contumeliæ causa nominaret." Idem in Tib. cap. 27. And it is a famous saying of the same Tiberius which Dion Cassius has recorded, (lib. 57, p. 607. Edit. Hanoviæ, 1606), "πρόκριτός τὶ τῆς Γερουσίας, κατα τὸ ἀρχαῖον, καὶ ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἀνομάζεται· καὶ πολλάκις γε ἔλεγεν ὅτι Δεσπότης μεν τῶν δούλων, Αὐτοκράτωρ, δὲ τῶν στρατιωτῶν, τῶν δὲ δὴ λοιπῶν πρόκριτος εἰμί." Principisque Senatus, more antiquo, nomen ipse sibi tribuebat, sæpius dicens *dominum* se *servorum, imperatorem militum, principem cæterorum* esse.

"*Dominum* se appellari ve tuit," says Lampridius of Alexander Severus, cap. 4, p. 885. Edit. Lugd. Bat. 1672.

As for Trajan, he was so far from assuming to himself the title of *Dominus*, that if we may believe Sex. Aur. Victor, he called himself only a moderator. "Usque eo innocentiæ fidens, uti præfectum prætorio Saburanum nomine, cum insigne potestatis, uti mos erat, pugionem daret crebro, monuerit; tibi istud ad munimentum mei committo, si recte agam: sin aliter, in me magis: quod *moderatorem* omnium vel errare minus fas sit." And it is remarkable that Pliny in his excellent panegyric on the same Trajan, does not so much as once call him *dominus*, but all along *princeps*, (the ordinary title given to the Emperors by Tacitus, Suetonius, and all others who have written about them), so he indeed calls him more than a hundred times in that one oration. Nay, comparing him with Domitian, he says, they had changed a *lord* for a *prince*. "Non enim de tyranno, sed de cive, non de *domino*, sed de *parente* loquimur." (P. 327. Edit. Lugd. Bat. 1640); [Reg. Ed. Plin. Paneg. ii. 3.—E.] And, p. 332 —"non enim *servulis* tuis *dominum* —— sed *principem civibus*, daturus imperator."—[*Ibid.* vii. 6.—E.] And, p. 361—"Scis, ut sicut diversa natura *dominatio* et *principatus*, ita non aliis esse *principem* gratiorem, quam qui maxime *dominum* graventur."—[*Ibid.* xlv. 3.—E.] And, p. 371 —"Hic (Trajanus) regnum ipsum, quæque alia captivitas gignet, arcet ac summovet, sedemque obtinet *Principis*, ne sit *Domino* locus."—[*Ibid.* 55-6. —E.] On the other hand,

Suetonius frequently reproaches Caligula with *domination*, particularly cap. 10, and 47. And cap. 49, to his perpetual infamy, he says of him—"Edixit et reverti se, sed iis tantum, qui optarent, equestri ordini et populo: nam se neque civem neque *principem* senatui amplius fore." And of *Nero*, (cap. 35,) 'Libertos divites et senes, olim adoptionis, mox *dominationis* suæ fautores atque rectores, veneno, partim cibis, partim potionibus indito, intercepit.' And cap. 37, 'Elatus—negavit, quenquam *principum* scisse, quid sibi liceret.' And of *Domitian*, (cap. 13,) 'Acclamari etiam in Amphitheatro epuli die lubenter audiit: '*domino* et *dominæ* feliciter.' But what was the result? See cap. 14, which begins thus—"Per hæc terribilis cunctis et invisus, tandem oppressus est amicorum libertorumque intimorum conspiratione——." And Pliny (lib. 4, Ep. 11) says of him—"Pontifices maximi jure seu potius immanitate tyranni licentia *domini*, reliquos pontifices non in regiam sed in Albanam villam convocavit." And, lib. 8, Ep. 6.

"Omitto quod pullanti servo Prætoria ornamenta offeruntur; quippe offer-

counted ;[1] but if I can demonstrate, 1, That either G[ilbert] R[ule] has not read Blondel, or (which is nothing better) has not understood him; and, 2, That Blondel has both most fully and most frequently acknowledged that there was real prelacy in St Cyprian's time, I think I shall be sufficiently avenged of him.

IX.—I. Either G[ilbert] R[ule] has not read Blondel, or he has not understood him. This appears from what he hath said about him, viz. "that the whole design and strain of Blondel's Apologia pro sententia Hieronymi, is to prove that Episcopus and Presbyter were the same as both in *name* and *power* in the Apostolic Age of the Church, so in *power* in the first, second, third, and much of the fourth century, though he confesses that the *name* and some *majority* (not *higher jurisdiction)* was sooner given to the Bishop."[2] Now, I shall not at present enter upon any

untur a *servis*." And *ibid.* Ep. 14—Priorum temporum *servitus* ut aliarum artium optimarum, sic etiam juris Senatorii oblivionem quandam et ignorantiam induxit." And in his Panegyric, p. 368—Ante quidem ingentes hostiarum greges per capitolinum iter, magna sui parte velut intercepti, divertere via cogebantur, quum sævissimi *domini* atrocissimi effigies tanto victimarum cruore toleretur quantum ipse humani sanguinis profundebat. And p. 380—Hæc persuasio superbissimus *dominis* erat, ut sibi viderentur *principes* esse definere si quid facerent tanquam Senatores. And

As for Diocletian, Sex. Aur. Victor (De Cæsaribus) having given an account of diverse bad enough things about him, at length adds—"Levia tamen præ cæteris. Namque se primus omnium, Caligulam post, Domitianumque, *dominum* palam dici passus, et adorari se appellarique uti Deum." Such were the Emperors who assumed to themselves, or received from others, the title of *dominus*.

It would be endless, as I have said, to adduce all that might be found to this purpose in Livy, Seneca, Tacitus, Florus, and many others of the best Roman authors. See Grotius de Jure Belli, Lib. iii. cap. 14, sect. 5., where you have enough to satisfy your farther curiosity. What I have adduced is enough, perhaps more than enough, for my design. For from what I have cited, it is evident that in the true Roman dialect, a *dominus* is quite another thing than father, king, general, prince, emperor, &c., all which, nevertheless, have some more than bare priority of dignity, with regard to their correlatives. To conclude, therefore, let G[ilbert] R[ule] and his brethren either prove that the Roman Emperors, who refused to be called *domini*, and satisfied themselves with the more gentle and civil name of *principes*, were only *moderators* of the Senate, had only a priority of dignity and order without any imparity of power, or let them hereafter abstain from the improper, impertinent, calumnious phrase of "Church domination,"—improper, I say impertinent, and calumnious, as applied to Christian Bishops, who do not, cannot, never did, never could, pretend to any domination.

[1] Sect. 1. c. [2] Sect. 12, p. 13, 14.

troublesome enquiry about the nature of this *some majority* which yet is not *higher jurisdiction*, though, considering what hath been already said,[1] G[ilbert] R[ule] may fix some difficulties about it, and though Blondel would have certainly laughed at him, had he heard him talking so,—Blondel, I say, who reckons it ridiculous to attempt to separate presidency from authority, or governing power.[2] Not to insist on this (I say) I do affirm that we have here very fair evidence that G[ilbert] R[ule] (allowing him to be a man of common ingenuity) when he wrote so, was very much a stranger to Blondel's book, at least, to the sense and purpose of it; for whoso shall consider it, shall find it manifestly false, that Blondel either affirms or attempts to prove that Episcopus and Presbyter were the same in *power* in any of the named centuries.

X.—Blondel's plot (in short) is plainly to justify the constitution of those Churches which are governed without Bishops; to maintain the validity of their orders, and, by consequence of their Sacraments, and other ministerial performances, or, in other words, that their want of Bishops does not unchurch them. Now, as it was not necessary for serving this design to state the controversy he was chiefly to manage upon the point of parity or imparity; (which I shall hereafter prove to be the true state of the controversy between us and our brethren), so neither has he done it any where in all his book. The great question which he ventilates, and whereof he always maintains the affirmative, is, whether Bishops and Presbyters do originally make but one order? which is indeed little better than a school nicety, and when sifted to the bottom, will be found little other than a controversy about words. But whatever be of this, I do again affirm that this is the great controversy that is pursued by Blondel, as it were easy to shew most fully. Whoso has leisure and abilities for reading such a book, if he reads it with attention, shall be sure to find this

[1] Sect. 3.

[2] Quotquot Presbyteros sub Episcopis, jure divino, constitutos, illorumque consilio, sed sine auctoritate ipsismet propria, ab his Ecclesias regi debere putant, vel pueris ludibrium debeant necesse est: Quis enim præsidentiam sine auctoritate somniet, cum præsidentiam ab ipsa regendi auctoritate nullatenus differre noverint qui nondum ære lavantur? Apol. pro Sant. Hieron. p. 39.

to be his chief aim from one end of it to the other. He who is not willing to read so much may consult p. 5, 6, 32, 33, &c. of the Preface, and of the Book, p. 1, 31, 32, 37, 43, 44, 52, 60, 61, 65, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 77, 90, 141, 142, 143, 155, 157, 158, 174, 190, 191, 192, 193, 287, 316, 347, 363, 364, 365. In each of which (besides many more) he may find Blondel either in express terms affirming, or by fair consequence implying, that this is his great business. The reader who has not opportunity to read such a book, may take the following account of Mr Blondel's scheme.

XI.—I. He is most positive and peremptory that there were constant moderators from the very beginning—fixed presidents of presbyteries from the very first erection of presbyteries. This he lays such stress on, as to tell plainly, that without it, it is not possible to evite insuperable difficulties.[1] I suppose he meant that this was absolutely necessary for eviting of two distinct orders, one of Bishops, the other of presbyters, from the beginning.

XII.—2. He makes those constant moderators to have succeeded, at first, according to their seniority. He that was first ordained a presbyter did, as such, succeed to the chair without more ado, without any farther solemnity or ceremony of either election or consecration. This is so plainly and frequently asserted, and so laboriously attempted to be proved by him, (though I am confident without success), that it is needless to spend more words about it. Having laid these foundations, he reckons

XIII.—3. That it follows by necessary consequence, that such Churches as want Bishops of any order distinct from that of presbyters, have all that is necessary to constitute them true Churches, if they have presbyters—having these, they have all that the Churches of the first erection had. Such Churches have only resumed the original form, and re-

[1] Quod (seniorem, Presbyterum, qua talem, ἐν τῇ πρεσβυτερίᾳ successisse) alta mente repostum teneant velim, quotquot (dum in veteres Ecclesiarum Primariarum, Romanæ, Antiochenæ, &c. tabulas incidunt) in hunc unum successionis ordinem quem nunc usitatum vident, oculis defixis hærent, usque dum improvisis difficultatibus obruantur; hæc enim una (si quid capere valeo) se ex ejusmodi salebris expediendi via commoda suppetit, si quam supra de seniorum sub Apostolis Apostolicisque viris et primatu et successione hypothesin statuimus —— fundamenti loco sternant. Præf. p. 7.

turned to the primitive constitution: their orders therefore are valid, and all regular acts which proceed from them. This is Blondel's scheme; for that he never so much as once intended to controvert the lawfulness of imparity or real prelacy in the practice of Church Government; that he never so much as once dreamed of making the government of the Church administered by pastors acting in parity, an unalterable institution—is evident as light from many considerations, particularly,

XIV.—1. As he entituled his book, "An Apology for St Jerom's Opinion," so all along he affirms that he is only explaining and defending that opinion. Now it is certain St Jerom never pleaded for the unalterable right of parity. Indeed Blondel purges Jerom of Aerianism, upon this very score that he was not (as Aerius) an enemy to prelacy.[1]

XV.—2. His concessions of the lawfulness of Episcopacy are both plain and numerous. You have a taste of them on the margin,[2] but this is not all; for

[1] Pref. p. 29, fusè.

[2] Blondel most clearly condemns those—"Qui rem ipsam (Episcopatum) a vitiis adnatis nequaquam distinguunt —— sed primam illam electorum κατ' ἐκλησίαν, Presbyterorum, qui postea, restricto vocabuli usu, Episcopi dicti sunt, a sanctis Dei Martyribus promanantem institutionem, ut purum puteum Antichristianismum (præter meritum) exhorrent, nec sine corruptelis, quas primis institutoribus imputare audent, extitisse unquam putant." Præf. p. 50. And p. 51 · "Cum igitur suo res quæque pretio æstimanda veniat Episcopatum (qua Presbyterio supereminet) verus ac proprius honor manere debet, ut Ecclesiastica constitutio (quod revera est) habeatur," &c.

In the book itself, p. 53—"Hanc originalem Ecclesiasticæ politiæ formam sub Apostolorum oculis natam —— fac tamen Apostolis non modo improbantibus sed palam laudantibus ortam; ego sane libere ab initio observatam, Christianisque sive ab Apostolis, sive ab eorum discipulis traditam, sed ut mutabilem et pro usu ac arbitrio Ecclesiæ mutandam crediderim." So he talks of his own fancied model. And

Page 193—"Unicus enim ubique est, fuit que ab initio Christianorum Episcopatus, quem, Christi (sive revera sive in speciem) servi, non qua ὑπερίχοντες, Collegarum Præsules et Presbyteriorum præpositi, sed qua Presbyteri πρεσβυτερίῳ ἐγκαταλιχθέντες Presbyteriorum albo adscripti administrarunt; ut ἐπισκοπὴ per se considerata, ad Ecclesiarum regimen absolutè, ἐπισκοπῇ annexa ὑπερoχὴ, ad regiminis modum, solamque ἐυταξίαν pertineat; quam suo semper arbitrio permissam seculorum omnium credidit Ecclesia: Nec opus sit vel ad triplicis Episcopatus (Divini, humani, et Satanici) distinctionem confugere, vel quicquid humana Christum profitentium consuetudo in divinorum usu ausa est, nefas putare: Cum lege fidei manente, cætera jam disciplinæ et conversationis admittere novitatem correctionis, suasque in rebus hujusmodi, Christianæ prudentiæ

XVI.—3. Blondel in most express terms makes an imparity, or majority of power, intrinsic to the notion of his constant moderator or president, of him who at the beginning was promoted to his chair by his seniority; so that, according to his scheme, the primitive Church was never governed by pastors acting in parity. He says, "his constant president had a singular and peerless power,"[1]—"he had not only the chair but the *chief power* in the presbytery,"[2]—"he was head of the college,"[3] and "had a primacy," "the rest of the presbyters freely conferred on him the honour of the *chief power* as well as the *chief* chair."[4] And I hope this imports something more than a priority of dignity or order. Nay, as he was president,—as he had the prerogative of the *chief power* and chair,—as he was "Fratrum" ἔξαρχος *i. e.* the

partes obire licere in confesso sit; Nec ulla (etiam nunc Ecclesia) in exemplum trahi possit quæ ex generali hoc Divini juris præcepto, πάντα ἐυσχημόνως καὶ κατα τάξιν γινέσθω, quæcunque et decentiora et commodiora sequendi plenam sibi potestatem factam non censeat. *Vide plura*, p. 54, 157, 364.

Indeed, he most zealously condemns all separation, all breach of peace and Church communion, upon the account of Episcopacy, in his Preface, p. 59, and most fully in his book, p. 179, 180. And it is a memorable account which Dr Peter du Moulin, the son, gives about him in a letter to Dr Durel, and published by this Doctor in his "View of the Government and Public Worship of God in the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas," p. 339, 340, where Moulin tells that Blondel had concluded his Apologia pro sententia Hieronymi, with words to this purpose, "By all that we have said to assert the right of the Presbytery, we do not intend to invalidate† the ancient and Apostolical constitution of Episcopal preeminence: But we believe that wheresoever it is established, conformably to the ancient canons, it must be carefully preserved; and wheresoever, by some heat of contention or otherwise, it hath been put down or violated, it ought to be reverently restored." And that BY THE VEHEMENCY AND UNWEARIED IMPORTUNITIES OF THE SCOTS ESPECIALLY, HE WAS PREVAILED WITH TO PUT OUT THAT CONCLUSION. [Blondel's book had been written at the request of the Westminster Assembly—of the Scottish members especially, who had their agents in Paris, for the purpose of winning over the French Protestants to their side.—E.] This, I say, is memorable; for it is unquestionably true, as appears by the letter; and it gives us Blondel's opinion, not only of the lawfulness, but also of the preferableness, of Episcopacy to any other form of government.

[1] Fuitque tunc (ab ipsis Apostolorum temporibus) πρεσβεία illa seniorum eique adnexa *singularis* quædam et *exors* (qualis præsidentium omnium quo modocunque constitutorum fuit et erit semper) *potestas*, non Presbyterio major ordo, sed Presbyterio inter ἡμιτελεῖς fungentis ætati debita, proprio (si loqui fas sit) nataliu in Christo jure, prærogativa. Præf. p. 6. [2] *Ibid.* p. 7 [3] *Ibid.* p. 28. [4] *Ibid.* p. 33.

prince or captain of the brethren, he neither had nor could have any colleagues—he could have none but successors."[1] And a great deal more to this purpose. And it is observable that he does not (as some, most groundlessly), make the Apocalyptic Angels to whom the Epistles Rev. 2 and 3 were directed, collective bodies, but single persons,—persons who had, so far, the *chief power*, that they were peculiarly chargeable with the enormities committed in the respective Churches over which they presided.[2] This, I say, is observable, because our presbyterian brethren cannot honestly deny it to be a solid evidence of Blondel's acknowledging those presidents to have had a majority of power, when they remember that to avoid the necessary inference of such a majority, they have found it needful to deny that those Angels were single persons, and to make them to have been collective bodies. Neither is it of any weight against what I have said, that Blondel sometimes seems to affirm that those presidents acted in parity with the rest of the College: for more than once he hath sufficiently explained himself, by telling us that they were all equal, indeed as to the order, which was one and the same in all;—all of them had the habitual power, the *actus primus*, as they call it, in parity, but they were not peers in the exercise of it. In the actual administration of that power, the president had a notorious chiefty, a majority; he was distinguished from, and eminent above the rest of the College. Indeed

XVII.—4. That I have truly represented Blondel's scheme, and that he never intended to plead for parity, is demonstratively evident from the nature and tendency of all the arguments he brings for proving his side of the con-

[1] Linus qua collegii sacri senior prima cathedra donatus, fratrumque ἔξαρχος, collegas nullos habuit aut habere potuit, sed successores tantum. Præf. p. 35.

[2] Ad hos presbyteriorum præpositos —— confluente (ex communi collegarum consensu) primâ Ecclesiæ cujusque curâ; cum et publice in collectis sedulis universam fraternitatem hortamentis, ad bonum pietatis certamen, fidaque charitati obsequia excitare, eandem precibus Deo commendare, ordinis consessus cogere, omnibus exemplo præire ex officio tenerentur ac se, pro virili, Dei ad homines nuncios præstare; iis ceu ἔξαρχοις commissi gregis tam κατορθώματα quam pudenda ex æquo et imputari potuere, et a Domino ipso Ecclesiarum Asiaticarum angelos cælestibus monitis ad fidei constantiam armante imputata sunt. Præf. p. 6.

troversy. To prove that Bishops and Presbyters did not make different orders, and not that they had not different powers, is, and only can be the purpose of the pitiful argument (he so much insists on), taken from the *dichotomy* of the clergy into the two orders of Priests and Deacons. For that he did not so copiously and zealously insist on that argument to prove that the Church was governed by pastors acting in parity, is so clear that it requires no proof. In short, for proving his point, whatever it was, he has collected a train of testimonies, not from the fathers of the first three, and much of the fourth, (as G[ilbert] R[ule] either ignorantly or disingenuously misrepresents the matter), but from both fathers and councils, from the apostles down to the end of the ninth century. And not only so, but he farther tells he had in readiness to be produced, for confirming his side of the controversy, the testimonies of about thirty-six popish authors, among whom [were ?] divers cardinals,[1] and two or three Popes.[2] Nay, he is at pains to reconcile his scheme and principles with the Council of Trent itself.[3] Now I am not to deny that his undertaking was odd enough, and all along oddly enough managed; but certainly it had been something more than oddness to have attempted to have made not only all the fathers and councils of the first nine centuries, but also so many Popes and Cardinals, and even the Council of Trent, advocates for Scottish Presbytery, *i. e.* for a government of the Church administered by pastors acting in parity. And now, by this short account I have given of Mr Blondel's scheme and controversy, the reader may judge whether G[ilbert R[ule] had read Blondel's preface and book, or, having read them, whether he had understood them, when he affirmed that Blondel's design was to prove that Bishop and Presbyter were the same in *power* in the first, second, third, and much of the fourth centuries. Indeed,

XVIII. — Some pages of Blondel's book G[ilbert] R[ule] seems to have read, which either he has not understood at all, or he must be very disingenuous. He affirms[4] that Blondel says, that Jerome's "Toto Orbe decretum est ut unus de Presbyteris cæteris superponeretur," was "quarto a

[1] Præf. p. 61. [2] *Ibid.* p. 61, 62. [3] *Ibid.* p. 62, 63. [4] Sect. 12, p. 14.

Corinthiorum turbis seculo ;" and that he, Blondel, proves it from Jerome's own words, which are " quando non idipsum omnes loquimur, et alius dicit, EGO SUM PAULI, EGO APOLLO, EGO CEPHÆ, dividimus spiritus unitatem, et eam in partes et in membra discerpimus." And he, the same Blondel, saith that Jerome " torquebat verba Paulina de Corinthiis, in eos ; nempe sui temporis homines." Nothing, I say, but ignorance or disingenuity,—both qualities misbecoming any controvertist, especially a proclaimed champion for a Church, could have prompted G[ilbert] R[ule] to affirm so,—for Blondel never said so, never thought so,—as I am confident will convincingly appear to every man of common sense who shall read and understand all that Blondel hath said in this matter, which I have faithfully transcribed on the margin.[1] And so I proceed

XIX.—II. To the other thing I undertook to make appear, namely, that Blondel has most fully and most frequently acknowledged that Episcopacy was in the Church long before St Cyprian's time. His acknowledgments in-

[1] Consuetudo illa (quâ Episcopi, Hieronymo, Presbyteris majores, &c.) non ex quo primum inter Corinthios auditum fuit, " EGO SUM PAULI," &c. sed paulatim invaluit. Quod adversus eos diligentius notandum venit quos Hieronymianæ phraseos nudo cortici eo fine inhærere mordicus juvat, quo liberius a clarissimi scriptoris mente aberrare sinantur. Ut ut enim apostolis vel auctoribus vel consciis superpositos Presbyteris Episcopos autument, eos circumstantes undique Paulinæ historiæ characteres revincunt. —— Meminerit insuper veri studiosus lector, nequaquam Hieronymum vel scripsisse vel scribere cogitasse, simulac Corinthi dictum fuit—" EGO SUM PAULI," toto orbe decretum, ut unus de Presbyteris electus cæteris superponeretur, sed postquam id dictum in populis, id est, postquam alii passim Corinthiorum more dementati, in partes discerpti sunt ; *quod ante annum* 140 *evenisse, idonee vix quisquam probaverit.* Observandum denique eodem fere (ex Hieronymi mente) sensu de quibuscunque schismaticis dici quod Corinthiis proprie conveniebat, quo de Chrysostomo "cecidit cecidit Babylon ;" de Palæstinis præsulibus " multi utroque claudicant pede ;" de Joanne Hierosolymitano, " Capta Hierusalem tenetur a Nebuchodonosor, nec Hieremiæ vult audire consilia ;" de Romano Clero, " Pharisæorum conclamavit Senatus ;" ab eodem Patre usurpatum legimus. Sic enim (quarto a Corinthiorum turbis seculo) de sui temporis hominibus, ait, " quando non idipsum omnes loquimur, et alius dicit," EGO SUM PAULI, EGO APOLLO, EGO CEPHÆ, " dividimus Spiritus unitatem, et eam in partes et in membra discerpimus." Nemo (opinor) anno 386 his verbis utebatur, quia tamen non deerant factiosi, qui Corporis Dominici compagem, qua seditiosis clamoribus, qua flagitiosis molitionibus solverent, Paulina in eos de Corinthiis verba torquere non dubitavit Hieronymus. Hæc Blond. pol. pro sent. Hieronymi p. 3 4.

deed are so many that it were easy to fill many pages with them. I shall content myself with such a competent number as may satisfy any reasonable man, even G[ilbert] R[ule] himself. Briefly then,

XX.—I. Doth not Blondel particularly fix the year 140 as the time, in or about which Episcopacy was introduced? Doth he not expressly say that Jerome allowed it to have been introduced when everywhere the people, being mad after the example of the Corinthians, began to divide and separate from one another, which, says he, cannot be competently proved to have been before the year 140?[1] And was not the year 140 long before the year 248? I know G[ilbert] R[ule] in his "Good Old Way Defended,"[2] chastises A[lexander] M[onro], D.D. for adducing this concession of Blondel's, and that he calls it a foul misrepresentation. Why such hard words? Blondel (forsooth) is there speaking of the divisions in which one said, I am of Paul, &c., and that this could not be proved to be before the year 140. "Now it is probable," says G[ilbert] R[ule], "that Episcopacy, as the supposed remedy, was not presently applied on the first appearance of the malady, but that other means were used." But had G[ilbert R[ule] done himself the favour to have read Blondel's preface, he would have found that A[lexander] M[onro], D.D. had made a very fair, a very just, a very cleanly representation: He would have found Blondel p. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, very earnest to persuade his reader that the change of government was made at Jerusalem about the year 135 or 136, and p. 17, 18, 19, 20, at Alexandria, about the year 143, and p. 25, 26, 27, &c. at Rome, about the year 140.[3]

XXI.—2. How frequently does Blondel acknowledge that Episcopacy was introduced in the second century? For this let the plain testimonies on the margin be considered.[4]

[1] *Vide* mox citata. sect. 18. [2] P. 145.

[3] [*Vide* Pref. to Apol. pro Sent. Hieron. p. 31.—E.]

[4] Quicquid ordinariæ functionis, ac ὑπερεχῆς iis (in quorum gratiam tituli Episcopalis reservatio primum facta est) competit, post Apostolorum omnium (sive ἀπρεπῶς καὶ ἀληθῶς sive πλατυπῶς [πλατύτερως?] dictorum) decessum, ab Ecclesia *secundi seculi* (pro jure suo) libere concessum fuit; ut vere καὶ ἀναντιῤῥήτως consuetudine magis quam Dominicæ dispositionis veritate, reliquis Presbyteris ad quos κοινῶς (ex Scripturarum mente) pertinebat Επισκοπή, majores factos scripserit Hieronymus. Apol. p. 86. —— Post

XXII.—3. Doth not Blondel make Ignatius's Epistles counterfeit? Is it not plain that the great reason which moved him to do so was that they were so favourable to Episcopacy? And yet doth he not allow them to have been forged about the end of the second century?[1] Doth he not more than once most plainly grant that Episcopacy was introduced before Tertullian wrote his book about Baptism, which yet he himself affirms to have been written anno 197?[2] nay, doth he not expressly tell us, "that about the year 146, Marcion was ambitious to have been promoted to the Roman Bishoprick?[3] Once more—

XXIII.—4. Hear him concerning St Cyprian's time, particularly while he is discoursing concerning Fabianus's ordaining Novatianus a presbyter (which he makes to have been done anno 240,[4] *i. e.* seven or eight years before St Cyprian was Bishop of Carthage) he grants, that by the custom then received, "the Bishop was the chief governour; that all acts of ecclesiastical authority were directed by him; that he was seated on the top of the priesthood; and that by reason of his *peerless* and *eminent* power, he was singularly chargeable with, and accountable for mismanage-

divisos (Ecclesiarum *secundi seculi* decreto) ab Episcopis Presbyteros —— *Ibid.* p. 92.

Cum igitur anxie nunc quæratur, quâ lege ac auctoritate, Ecclesiastica quædam Prælatis munera, cum pontificatus apice reserventur; tutâ cum veteribus universis, conscientia respondere licuerit, *Canonica*, illa scil. quæ, anno circiter *ducentesimo*, Presbyteros Diaconosque non sine Episcopi auctoritate, propter Ecclesiæ honorem, baptismum dandi jus habere Tertulliano persuasit. *Ibid.* p. 176.

Ubique fere ante *secundi seculi* finem admissa Episcopalis ἀπιρεχή. *Ibid.* p. 358. *Vide* Plura huc spectantia, p. 31, 32, 35, 37, 266, 294.

[1] Preface, p. 43, 46, 49.

[2] —— sed gliscente indies longius a veteri more (cujus jamdudum fastidium cæperat) abeundi desiderio; sensim contrahi primæva libertas cæpit, non ejus abolendæ, sed curandæ ne in vagam licentiam degeneraret animo, etiamsi Episcopi clero universo præpositi et Presbyterorum totius Ecclesiæ decreto subditorum communes functiones essent, nec hi quæ antiquo jure poterant sine Episcopi auctoritate aggrediebantur, propter Ecclesiæ honorem, quo salvo salva pax erat. Tert. de Baptismo, cap. 17; hæc Blond. Præf. p. 38, 39, *Vide* etiam superius citata, ex p. 176, sect. 21.

[3] De sede Romana per quadriennium viduata invadenda Marcionem cogitasse, &c. Apol. p. 19, 20, Nec mirum clarissima enim Epiphanii verba quem Blondellus citat sequiturque "Ζήλῳ λοιπὸν ἐπαρθεὶς ὡς ἂν ἀπολήψοι τὴν πρωτοδρίαν," &c. Epiph. Hær. 42.

[4] P. 328.

ments."[1] And discoursing of Novatus and his complices, who were, as much as men could be, St. Cyprian's contemporaries, he says, in so many words—"That Presbyters were then by custom subject to Bishops,"[2] and that Cyprian had reason to "resent the behaviour of Presbyters, who, contrary to the order then received, presumed to act by themselves, without reserving to the Bishop, not only the hònour of his *chair*, but also of his *priesthood*."[3] Nay, he makes the Episcopal power to have been as considerable not only in, but even before St Cyprian's time, as it was in the seventh century.[4] Farther yet, he acknowledges that in St Cyprian's time, [and long before it, ever since the distinction was made between Bishops and Presbyters], "Bishops and Presbyters were promoted by distinct ordinations, and made distinct Colleges.[5] And whereas, during the first constitution of Church Government, by which all pastors were equal, he affirms that two Bishops might very well have been at once in one city or church;[6] yet concerning St Cyprian's time, he both affirms and proves, that "the canons and customs allowed only of one Bishop at once in any church or city."[7] But what needs more?

[1] In ordinationibus et sacris aliis functionibus, præcipuus actor Episcopus fuit; non quia jure ullo sive divino sive Apostolico ad πρωτεῖα provectus credebatur; sed quia per eum omnem Ecclesiæ actum gubernari, in *apice pontificatus* collocatum suo et Collegarum nomine agere, eòque præcipuum actorem fieri, libere *ascito mori* placuerat. Leges ab Episcopo pœnas repetentes, tanquam de uno loquutæ sunt, non ut Presbyteros, *consuetudine minores*, immunes ab iisdem præstarent, sed ut Episcopi cui *exortem et eminentem potestatem* dederant, præcipue culpandam et plectendam παρανομίαν indicarent, nec facile evasuros *minores*, si *præcipuos* (imo *summos*) fulgura montes ferirent. Apol. p. 347.

[2] Nec proprie (*i. e.* non solum) ob calcatum *pontificatus* cui *ex more subdebantur apicem*, sed ob proditum evangelium, læsosque fratres exarsit — Apol. p. 297.

[3] Quia insuper habita omni consiliorum collatione, nec Episcopo *honorem sacerdotii* sui ac *cathedræ* reservantes —— intolerandam planè eorum audaciam merito censuit *recepti moris* vindex Cyprianus. *Ibid.* p. 297.

[4] An solutior Cypriani ætate *Episcoporum potestas*, quam vel ante fuerat, vel post, ad annum usque septingentesimum fuisse videatur? Apol. p. 299.

[5] Formam a præcedente (forma, quâ promovebantur Episcopi) aliam, analogiâ eadem semper manente (ex quo distinctis Cleri gradibus, *diversa* Episcoporum et Presbyterorum *collegia* instituere per Ecclesias visum est) inducere necesse fuit. P. 162.

[6] Necdum duos, uno eodemque loco, Episcopos sedere ἄτοπον visum fuerat. Præface, p. 6.

[7] *Vide* Apol. p. 188, 189, fusè.

Turn only to that part of his Apology where he directly treats of St Cyprian,[1] and he tells you, that, "by custom long before received, Cyprian was superior to Presbyters." And in his summing up of his evidences from St Cyprian,[2] "In one word," says he, "Presbyters in St Cyprian's time were the same, *de jure*, of right, with Bishops, although, *de facto*, in fact, they were so distinguished, that those who were *equal* in function were *unequal* in the exercise of it." From which words we have not only a fair acknowledgment of *imparity* in St Cyprian's time, but also a clear account of Blondel's main controversy, viz.—"That he did not plead for the *parity of power* between Bishop and Presbyter, but only for their making one and the same order."

XXIV.—By this time the reader, (especially if he remembers what was discoursed, sect. 3, concerning the necessity of moderators, &c.), may judge whether Blondel acknowledged Episcopacy to have been in the Church in and before St Cyprian's time, and, by consequence, whether G[ilbert] R[ule] had reason to affirm that Blondel did not allow it to have got footing before Jerome's time, who, by Blondel's own reckoning, lived at least one hundred and sixty years after St Cyprian; and whether he had reason to say, that "either I had not read Blondel, but cited him at adventure, or that I have a confidence to assert what I will, though absurd and unaccountable." And so I leave Blondel.

XXV.—Salmasius comes next to be considered. G[ilbert] R[ule] says I am as unhappy in him as in Blondel. I say I am as happy as I could wish, if I am not unhappier. And I think myself so sure that I am not, that I will not produce the tenth part of Salmasius's acknowledgments of the prevalency of Prelacy in and before St Cyprian's time. And yet I shall produce that which may be sufficient to put G[ilbert] R[ule] to the blush, if he is capable of it. Particularly—

XXVI.—1. It is observable that Salmasius most fre-

[1] Hic [*recepto jamdudum more*] Presbyteris *Præpositus* οὐδὲν ἀρχοντικῶς ἢ ἀνδικτικῶς toto administrationis tempore aggressus est, &c. Apol. p. 41. That is he had superior, though he claimed not a sole power.

[2] Uno verbo, iidem [*de jure*] erant cum Episcopis Presbyteri, licet [*de facto*], ab invicem distinguerentur, ut qui *revera* munere *pares* erant, muneris *usu impares* fierent. Apol. p. 44.

quently declares he shall be satisfied if you grant to him that Episcopacy was not instituted by the Apostles.[1] Allow him that, and he can allow it to have been introduced at any time after their decease. This he has many times over and over in his Walo Messalinus,[2] as, indeed, no author I have ever read has indulged himself more in frequent and unnecessary repetitions. But to go on.

XXVII.—2. Most frequently he acknowledges that the offices were distinguished as soon as the names were appropriated, viz. that of Bishop to the President, and that of Presbyters to the rest of the Priests; or rather he makes the impropriation of names to have been posterior to, and founded upon the distinction of the offices. This I take to be fully proved by the testimonies on the margin.[3] Now, I am persuaded G[ilbert] R[ule] himself will not deny that the names were impropriated in St Cyprian's time; or, if he shall, I shall only desire him to produce one instance, either from St Cyprian or his contemporaries, where he, that was but a single Presbyter in office, was called a Bishop. Besides—

XXVIII.—3. If G[ilbert] R[ule] will take Salmasius's word for it, he may believe that Bishops and Presbyters had distinct ordinations, and made distinct colleges, as soon as the offices were distinguished, or the names were impropriated.[4] And if distinct ordinations and distinct

[1] [The great question with Salmasius was "Fuerit ne *temporibus Apostolicis* indistinctus ab Episcopo Presbyter?"—E.]

[2] *Vide* p. 7, 117, 119, 144, 177, 181, 248, 283, 419, Edit. Ludg. Bat. 1641.

[3] Cum pares essent omnes et in uno eodemque gradu consisterent, dicebantur et omnes tam Episcopi quam Presbyteri, promiscue et indifferenter: postquam ordinum inductum est discrimen, nominum quoque distinctio simul invecta est.—Wal. Mess. p. 125. Ubi unus ex numero plurium eligi cæptus est, qui omnibus preponeretur, non amplius pristina *æqualitas* servata est; et ab eo tempore cæperunt Presbyteri *inferiores* esse Episcopis. Sic cessarunt antiquiores illi Episcopi. Tum enim Episcopus vocatus est qui multis præerat; Presbyteri nominati qui *uni suberant*, cum antea unus idemque esset *re* ac *potestate* Episcopus et Presbyter, solo nomine discrepantes.—P. 287. Postquam rerum distinctio facta est, tum etiam sequuta nominum, ut oportuit, discretio. Episcopi vocati sunt qui *præerant*, Presbyteri qui *suberant*.—P. 351. Rem verba sequuntur, signant ac testantur. Cum confuse erant appellationes, etiam officia indiscreta habita sunt, Presbyteri et Episcopi. Ubi distingui cæpta sunt vocabula, distinctio illa orta est ex rerum ipsarum et munerum discretione.—P. 365. *Vide plura*, p. 366.

[4] Cum Episcopus et presbyter idem esset, ordinatio ad utrumque per-

colleges may not infer *imparity*, I know not what may do it.

XXIX.—4. If G[ilbert] R[ule] shall not be satisfied with this way of reasoning by consequences, then I tell him that Salmasius, in most express terms, acknowledges Prelacy to have been very early in the Church, very soon after the Apostles, very long before St Cyprian. Salmasius, I say, talking of St Polycarp's Epistle to the Church of Philippi, observes, that "after the distinction was made between Bishops and Presbyters, no example can be produced of any Epistle written by a Bishop in the inscription whereof he joins his Presbyters with himself, as was done by Polycarp." And for proof of this he appeals to St Cyprian's Epistles. Now what can be a clearer concession that the Orders or Colleges were different in St Cyprian's time, if this is not?[1] he acknowledges Episcopacy to have been in Tertullian's time;[2] for he cites that famous testi-

tinuit, quia non alius a Presbytero Episcopus. Episcopus ordinabat Presbyterum et Presbyter Episcopum, quia idem ordo, idem gradus utriusque et unus fuit. Ubi distingui ordines et gradus cœpti sunt, atque Episcopus major extitit Presbytero, tum ordinatio non potuit utriusque esse communis: ut enim major ordinat minorem, superior inferiorem: ita e contrario, minor ordinare majorem non potest, neque inferior superiorem: inde igitur postquam minor Episcopo factus est Presbyter, ex ordinum discretione, non potuit minor ordinare majorem, hoc est, Presbyter Episcopum. Sic Episcopi ordinatio propria facta est, et ad Presbyterum desiit pertinere, quia Presbyter destitit esse Episcopus.—Wal. Mess. p. 298, 299. [Ex quibus verbis, duo evidentissime consequuntur; unum, Presbyteros ordinandi potestatem, post munerum distinctionem, ad Episcopos pertinuisse; alterum, Episcoporum ordinationem utpote quâ Presbyteros ordinandi potestas conferretur, a Presbyterorum ordinatione fuisse diversam. Distincta etiam Episcoporum et Presbyterorum fuisse collegia verbis dissertissimis asserit.]—P. 464. Alius ordo est [inquit] Presbyterorum, alius Episcoporum, postquam ex uno duo facti sunt. Et rursus, p. 465, "Singula distincta corpora suum ordinem fecerunt. Non collegæ sunt Episcopi Presbyterorum post introductam ordinum distinctionem."

[1] Non extat exemplum Epistolæ ab Episcopo ullo scriptæ postquam Episcopus superpositus est Presbyteris qui sibi in literarum παραγραφῇ comites et socios adjunxerit Presbyteros. Hoc enim in Collegis fieri solitum: ut apud Cyprianum sæpe: si Presbyteros una inscriberent, ita ponebant; "Cyprianus, Cæcilius, Victor Sedatus, Tertullus cum Presbyteris qui præsentes aderant," &c. Walo Mes. p. 232.

[2] Tertullianus in libro de baptismo —— discretionem Episcopalis ordinis et Presbyterici, sola auctoritate Ecclesiæ introductam, satis clare innuit his verbis—"*Dandi quidem baptismi jus habet summus sacerdos qui est Episcopus, dehinc Presbyteri et diaconi, non tamen sine Episcopi auctoritate, propter Ecclesiæ honorem, quo salvo salva pax est.*" Walo Mess. p. 389. [*Vide* etiam

mony " Dandi quidem jus," &c. more than once or twice, and always understands it, (not as G[ilbert] R[ule] has ridiculously glossed it,[1] but) as all men of sense have ever understood it—that is, so as to import that Presbyters were then so much subject to their Bishops that they could not baptize (more than Deacons) without his allowance; and all the advantage he attempts to make of it is, that " Tertullian doth sufficiently insinuate that it was not by Divine appointment, but by Ecclesiastical custom or constitution," that the Bishop had such a prerogative. He grants it to have been in Clemens Alexandrinus's time;[2] for considering the story which Eusebius[3] transcribes from Clemens Alexandrinus concerning the Apostle St John's planting of Churches and ordaining Bishops, &c. he says that " Clemens, as was ordinary with the Greeks, had an eye to the custom of his own time, by which the singular principality of Bishops was already introduced." Farther yet, doth not Salmasius acknowledge that the Epistles commonly ascribed to Ignatius are very plain for Prelatic government? doth he not, chiefly for that very reason, reject them as spurious? and yet doth he not make them to have been forged about the beginning, or at latest, the middle of the second century, at which time was introduced a singular Episcopacy above the Presbyterate?[4] Once more, doth not this learned author most plainly allow the order of Bishops as contradistinct from that of Presbyters to be most ancient, so very ancient that he only excepts the times of the Apostles?[5]

p. 293, et 294, ubi post eadem allata verba, hæc de suo addit Salmasius] Nec igitur hoc parvum discrimen, jus baptismi dandi penes Episcopum esse, quod non sit penes Presbyterum nisi interveniente Episcopi auctoritate. At non hoc perpetuum fuit, neque in omnibus Ecclesis servatum est, neque a principio ab Apostolis id institutum. *Vide* etiam p. 420, 421.

[1] Sect. 49, p. 72.

[2] Clemens Alexandrinus, ex quo eam historiam narrat Eusebius, more cæterorum Græcorum ad suorum temporum consuetudinem respexit, qua Episcoporum singularium principatus jam erat introductus, p. 223, 224.

[3] H. E. L. 3. E. 33.

[4] Epistolæ illæ natæ et suppositæ videntur circa initium aut medium secundi seculi, quo tempore primus singularis Episcopatus supra Presbyteratum introductus fuit, p. 253.

[5] Atqui hæretici illi quos vocas et trapezitici fænoris scriptor, nunquam negarunt antiqua etiam tempora discrimen illud inter Episcopos et Presbyteros agnovisse, qui sciunt, rem esse antiquissimam ut hi duo ordines in Ecclesia fuerint distincti, Episcoporum et Presbyterorum, si excipiantur Apostolica tempora.—Walo Mess. p. 7.

XXX.—Such concessions, and many more, has Salmasius in his Walo Messalinus; I say and many more, particularly one fairly contained in the one testimony produced by G[ilbert] R[ule] from this book, to prove that Salmasius did not acknowledge Episcopacy to have obtained in St Cyprian's time. G[ilbert] R[ule] has transcribed it faithfully enough. And I dare refer it to be determined by any reader of competent sense, whether it be not a fair concession that Episcopacy was introduced about the middle of the second century.

XXXI.—It were easy to adduce as many plain concessions to our present purpose from Salmasius "Apparatus ad Libros de Primatu Papæ." Whoso would see them may turn to the pages on the margin.[1] As for Salmasius's book, "De Presbyteris et Episcopis," which G[ilbert] R[ule] names as distinct from his "Walo Messalinus," I confess myself a stranger to it, I never heard of it before, I never heard any man say that he had seen it; I do not say there is no such book. It is simply possible that G[ilbert] R[ule] may have got it legated to him in manuscript by Salmasius, as to one who sometime or other might prove so eminent an advocate for the Divine right of parity. Only this I am sure of, if there is such a book, and if Episcopal government is denied in it to have obtained in St Cyprian's time, it flatly contradicts the aforesaid "Apparatus," as well as "Walo Messalinus." But to cut short.

XXXII.—Two other things I shall only desire G[ilbert] R[ule] hereafter to remember concerning Salmasius. One is, that he most plainly acknowledges even *Diocesan* Episcopacy to have been in St Cyprian's time.[2] The other,

[1] Walo Mess. p. 20, 21, 30, 40, 56, 59, 66, 88, 89, 91, 182, 198, 218, 239, 264, 307, et De Primatu Papæ, p. 6, 33, 43, 44, 57.

[2] Recitatis nempe hisce ad Cornelium sancti Cypriani verbis, "*Æquum esse pariter ac justum, ut uniuscujusque causa illic audiatur, ubi est crimen admissum*" (item hisce) "*Episcopatum unum esse cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*," hæc subdit Salmasius—"Loquitur quidem ex consuetudine temporis sui, qua Episcopi tum ita a Presbyterio erant divisi per unamquamque Ecclesiam ut unus multis præsset Presbyteris:" et paulo post—"Præterea illud etiam animadvertendum est, quot fuere Episcopi, ætate Cypriani, totidem fuisse Presbyteria, ac proinde totidem *Ecclesias Diocesanas*, easque in plures parœcias tam urbanas quam rurales divisas, quæ omnes uni Presbyterio parebant Apostolorum ævo ex eorundem instituto; et uni Episcopo cum suis Presbyteris, postquam Ecclesiæ consuetudine Epis-

that so soon as the two orders were distinguished, the Bishop had not only a *majority* of *dignity*, but also of *power*; that it was not barely a *priority* of *order*, but a *superiority* of *jurisdiction* that did distinguish them: nay, that (as we have already heard from Blondel)[1] a *primacy* of *order*, without a suitable *primacy* of *power*, is not very good sense, when attributed to persons of different orders.[2]

XXXIII.—But does not Salmasius say, that "the Episcopal jurisdiction did spring partly from the distinction of the names, partly from the indulgence of Christian Princes, and partly from the ambition of the Popes of Rome;" so it is indeed affirmed by G[ilbert] R[ule].[3] But whoso shall be at the pains to read that sixth chapter shall find reason to admire G[ilbert] R[ule]'s inadvertency in so affirming; for nothing can be plainer than that Salmasius, in that chapter, allows Episcopacy to have got footing very early—long before there were Christian Emperors—longer before there were Popes of Rome of the modern cut. In-

copus a corpore Presbyterorum sumptus, ab iis distinctus est, et toti Presbyterio præpositus. Apparat. ad lib. 6, de Primatu, &c. p. 238, 239.

[1] *Vide Supra*, sect. IX.

[2] Prima illa Primatus ratio (n, qui senioritatem sequebatur, quemadmodum supra Blondellus; iisdem quippe principiis nititur hic Salmasius) semper servata est quamdiu Apostoli aut eorum discipuli et comites Ecclesias rexere. Immo vel usque ad illud tempus quod notavimus ex auctore epistolarum Ignatianarum post Valentini nempe hæresin, sub Pio et Marco Antoninis. Non enim illa Apostolica et antiqua Ecclesiæ sub Episcopis iisdemque, Presbyteris gubernatio cessavit antequam distinctio nominum simul munerumque, et proinde etiam ordinum inter Presbyterum et Episcopum facta est. Tunc enim non Primatus illud proprié fuit quo Episcopus et Presbyter distinctus est, sed ἀρχὴ et præfectura. Primatus quippe tantum datur inter ejusdem ordinis et nominis munerisque consortes; nec Primatus, sive primus locus inter pares intelligitur, nisi et secundus sit et tertius et quartus usque ad ultimum. Ubi nomina divisa sunt, et ordo discretus, non est proprie Primatus quo ille qui præest in ordine superiore qui subsunt in inferiore, censentur. *Ibid.* p. 62.

[3] Ubi impositus est Episcopus Presbyteris, ut superior, tum æqualitate sublata quæ prius fuerat, ex superioris gradus eminentia nata est inferioris submissio ac subjectio Ordinationis tum discrimen intervenit, et ex ordinatione jurisdictio. Cum enim jus datum est superiori ut ordinaret inferiorem, tum superiori in inferiorem jurisdictio concessa est. Æquum enim visum est, ut non ab alio judicaretur inferior clericus, quam ab eo a quo ordinabatur. Accessit et imperatorum Christianorum auctoritas, ut Constantini et aliorum, qui legibus suis sanxere clericos a clericis debere judicari. Sic Jurisdictio Ecclesiastica et Episcopalis formata est; quam deinde promoverunt et auxerunt in majus, latiusque extenderunt decretis suis Romani Pontifices. Wal. Mess. cap. 6, p. 460, 461.

deed Salmasius says no more than that their jurisdiction was enlarged [not instituted] by Christian Magistrates, and in after times by Popes. He could not have expressed this more plainly than he has done. And who, I pray, can readily believe that Salmasius could have been so ridiculous as to have made Episcopacy to have had its first rise from the Roman Popes? what is this other than to say there were no Bishops till a Bishop introduced them?

XXXIV.—To conclude, it is obvious to any that shall compare Salmasius's books with Blondel's "Apologia," &c. that those two champions have very well understood one another. Their schemes are much of a piece; both affirm constant Moderators or Presidents to have been from the beginning; both make those Presidents at first to have been promoted by their seniority; both argue from the dichotomy of the Clergy into Priests and Deacons; and both agree in fixing much about the same time, *i. e.* the middle of the second century, for the introduction of Episcopacy. It is true they differ sometimes about lesser matters, or rather Salmasius sometimes differs from, nay contradicts himself, as even he himself confesses.[1] This I take notice of, because perchance G[ilbert] R[ule] (when he shall be at the pains to read him) may find him sometimes talking as if he did not allow Episcopacy to have been so early as St Cyprian's time; and, to tell truth, sometimes indeed he seems so to talk, particularly in his "Apparatus."[2] But this can amount to nothing against me; for besides that his concessions of Episcopacy's being in St Cyprian's time are much more numerous and deliberate than his denials, I may safely say ten for one, what though he had but five hundred times denied it, and had but five times, nay once, confessed it? if authors will needs contradict themselves who can help it? in such cases, indeed, G[ilbert] R[ule]'s rule may take place, viz.—"that contradictory assertions derogate from the authority of the asserter;"[3] but it can never follow that citing him for one of the contradictory propositions is unfair dealing, especially if the cited proposition was affirmed last, and after the proposition of which it is the contradictory, as it is in the present case; for in the

[1] Apparat. p. 111. [2] P. 112, 210, 232, 233.
[3] Cyp. Bish. Exam. p. 47, sect. 36.

very last page (almost the last words) of his "Apparatus," he acknowledges "Episcopacy to have prevailed in the second century."[1] And so I leave him.

XXXV.—Go we now to the Provincial Assembly of London, to try if they have made any such concession. G[ilbert] R[ule] says, "he knows not what book I meant; and that I myself do not know, for what appeareth."[2] Then he falls a naming books, viz:—"The Vindication of Presbyterian Government," &c. and "Jus Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici," and tells no such thing is to be found in them. But is it possible that G[ilbert] R[ule] has all his life been a stranger to a book entituled "Jus Divinum Ministerii Anglicani;" printed at London, 1654? If he has, then I do tell him there is such a book, and it has an Appendix added to it, wherein the "Judgement and Practice of Antiquity about the whole matter of Episcopacy, and especially about the Ordination of Ministers," is (pretended to be) briefly discussed: and I tell him farther, that it was that "Appendix" I meant. For there[3] they put this question.—"How long was it that the Church of Christ was governed by the Common Council of Presbyters without a Bishop set over them"? To which they answer thus, "Dr Blondel, a man of great learning and reading, undertakes in a large discourse to make out that before the year 140, (*i. e.* more than a full century before St Cyprian was Bishop of Carthage), there was not a Bishop set over Presbyters; to whose elaborate writings we refer the reader for farther satisfaction in this particular." In which words I did, and still do think these two things are clearly contained.—1. A fair acknowledgement that Blondel allowed Episcopacy to have been introduced about the year 140; 2. The assembly's plain agreement with Blondel concerning the time of its introduction. Let G[ilbert] R[ule] discover my mistake in either of the two, if he can.

XXXVI.—Would G[ilbert] R[ule] have any more of

[1] Constat Episcopatum quatenus Presbyteratu major est factus, inventionem esse humanæ dispositionis, atque ecclesiasticæ consuetudinis, quia ex Divinæ voluntatis præscripto, et ex Apostolica traditione atque usu primitivæ Ecclesiæ *per duo ferme secula* perpetim servato, Presbyteri iidem fuerunt cum Episcopis, et communi consilio singulas Ecclesias, quibus præsidebant, gubernaverunt. Apparat. p. 307, Edit. Ludg. Bat. 1645.

[2] Sect. 13, p. 16.

[3] P. 104.

this assembly? then let him turn over to the same "Appendix," p. 129, and he will find a certain second proposition of theirs in these very words—"That after that Bishops were admitted into the Church, yet notwithstanding ordination by Bishops, without the assistance of Presbyters, was always forbidden and opposed." And for proof of this proposition, he will find them proceeding thus, "Cyprian, in his exile, writing to his charge, certifies them that Aurelius was ordained by him and his colleagues who were present with him. By his colleagues he means his Presbyters, as appears Epist. 5, 8, and Fermilianus saith of them that rule the Church, "quod baptizandi, manum imponendi et ordinandi possident potestatem," and who those be, he expresseth a little before, "seniores et prepositi," by whom the Presbyters as well as Bishops are understood." Now, though they do most notably blunder concerning both authors, as afterwards may be made to appear,[1] yet all I take notice of at present is, that they adduce the instances of Cyprian and his contemporary Firmilian to prove the aforesaid proposition, which unavoidably imports an acknowledgment that it was before St Cyprian's time that Bishops were admitted into the Church.

XXXVII.—By this time the impartial reader may judge whether G[ilbert] R[ule] had reason to shut up his accounts of Chamier, Blondel, Salmasius, and the Provincial Assembly of London, in these words, "I shall not hope to say any thing that is convincing, if what I have brought do not persuade the unbiassed reader that our famous Presbyterians have the same sentiments of the judgment of the first antiquity, about the power of Presbyters in the Church, that I expressed in the place that our author (J[ohn] S[age] maketh such a pother about,"[2] that is, if it be to the purpose, that they did not acknowledge Episcopacy to have been in the Church before St Cyprian's time.

XXXVIII.—But I did likewise name Spanhemius as acknowledging as much as any of the aforementioned authors; and here I am whipped to purpose. For

1. G[ilbert] R[ule] "wonders that I should have brought Spanhem against him," why? because the words I cited "amount to no more than manifesta προστασία, which no Presbyterian ever denied to have crept early into the Church."[3]

[1] Cap. VI. [2] Sect. 13, p. 16. [3] *Ibid.*

Had G[ilbert] R[ule] told us plainly what he meant by manifesta προστασία we had the better understood one another, but I must make the best of it I can. Προστασία then may signify or import majority of power, as well as dignity; and if G[ilbert] R[ule] will allow that Spanhem meant so, I have my asking. But προστασία is likewise frequently understood by G[ilbert] R[ule] and his brethren to signify no more than the pre-eminence of a Presbyterian moderator, who acts in parity with the rest of the Presbytery; and if it is in this sense that G[ilbert] R[ule] here takes it, I will take the liberty to wonder as much at him as he does at me. And 1. I wonder how he came to say that such προστασία *crept early* into the Church. How can that be said to have *crept early* into the Church which was always in the Church? which was as *early* as there was a Church? which (as is confessed by all Presbyterians, G[ilbert] R[ule] himself not excepted), was in the Apostles' times, coeval with the very first Presbytery.[1] And 2. I wonder with what assurance G[ilbert] R[ule] can affirm that this was all the προστασία that was meant by Spanhemius; and that for two reasons, I. Because it is plain that Spanhem called it manifesta "προστασία" upon the account of the bright evidence there is for Episcopal pre-eminence in the third century, beyond what there was for it in the second. This, I say, is plain to any person who shall compare the account he gives of the state of the government of the Church in the second century, with his account which I cited concerning the third. Accounting for the second, he tells "that there were no other Ecclesiastical orders known in that age but those of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons," and he insinuates a doubt concerning Bishops and Presbyters, whether they were really or only nominally distinguished.[2] But when he comes to the third, he says in the words cited by me, "that Bishops had a *manifest pre-eminence*." This to me seems demonstration that he was not so much as thinking upon the simple pre-eminence or προστασία of a Presbyterian moderator. But this is not all: for, 2. He sufficiently explains what

[1] *Vide supra*, sect. 5.

[2] Ordines ecclesiasticos haud notas alios hac ætate—præter Episcopos Presbyteros (seu jam nominibus seu reipsa distinctos) et diaconos. [Compend Introd. ad Hist. Eccles. Nov. Test, sec. 2, sect. 5, p. 49. Ed. Lugd. Bat. 1694.—E.]

προστασία he meant, by the words immediately added for explanation, which I did likewise subjoin. He says, "manifesta προστασία seu jure præsidendi, convocandi, ordinandi," &c. Now, by the Presbyterian principles, the jus præsidendi, the right of presiding, is all that is essential to a Presbyterian moderator; for a Presbyterian moderator, as such, has not the "jus convocandi," the power of convocating, neither has he the "jus ordinandi," the power of ordaining. And according to G[ilbert] R[ule's] philosophy, whereby all &cs. must have vast bellies, who can tell what other rights or powers Spanhem[1] lodged in the vast belly of his &c.? And so much for G[ilbert] R[ule's] first blow.

XXXIX.—2. G[ilbert] R[ule] says "I dealt not fairly with that learned writer." Why so? "I curtailed his words,[1] leaving out what displeased me." Well! which were the words that so much displeased me as to move me to leave them out? These "Quanquam de Episcopis controversum diversi ne an (my book has "ac," which is certainly right), superioris ordinis haberentur:" that is, though it be a controversy whether Bishops were of a different and a superior order. Now, I would gladly know who told G[ilbert] R[ule] that it was displeasure that made me leave out these words? whoso has said so to him has abused him, as he ought to consider before he trust them again; for I do assure him they did not displease me. And why should they have done it? Blessed be God, as much a school boy as I am, I was not so childish as to imagine that Spanhem meant that it was a controversy in St Cyprian's time whether Bishops and Presbyters were of the same, or of different orders. And why should it have displeased me that Spanhem should have said that now a-days, it is a controversy? Why, I say, should his narrating such an uncontroverted matter of fact have created me the least grain of displeasure? I know perfectly well there is such a controversy.

[1] The same Spanhem in his "Ep. Respons. ad Amicum de nupera præfatione Joannis Vander Waayen," p. 47, thus—"Episcoporum inter Britannos nomini, gradui, dignitati saltem *altero* post nati Christum *seculo* in Ecclesia surgenti," &c. plainly ascribing its introduction to the second century. And all that Vander Waayen (though an ingrained Presbyterian, which Spanhem is not) has courage to say is, "Nec tempore Apostolorum, nec seculo primo, aut initio secundi, ullibi fuit istius modi Episcopatus qualis in Anglia nunc obtinet." *Vide* Ep. Apologet. p. 327.

I know it has been a controversy these very many years :— a controversy which has been warmly debated between Prelatists and Presbyterians, almost ever since the fatal controversies concerning Church government came to be warmly debated; nay, a controversy about which there has been no little tugging even among those who have been frank enough for Prelacy :—a controversy ever since Peter Lombard's time amongst the Popish writers; and a controversy even among the reformed Prelatists. For how many such have been who have maintained that Bishops and Presbyters do not make different orders, but only different degrees of one and the same order? Why then did I leave out these words of Spanhem's? for this very good reason—the purpose I was pursuing was no more concerned in them than in the Iliads of Homer, or the Odes of Horace. My purpose was to shew that Spanhem had acknowledged there was Episcopacy in St Cyprian's time; and let G[ilbert] R[ule] when he has leisure, tell me what or how much this purpose was concerned in the modern controversy, whether Bishops and Presbytery make two orders, or only two degrees of one and the same order. But the last charge is heaviest; for

XL.—3. G[ilbert] R[ule] says I have dealt unchristianly with Spanhem. I shall be sorry if I have. I do not love to deal unchristianly by any man. But where lies this unchristian dealing? In two things—1. In detracting from his knowledge of antiquity, as if, forsooth, Spanhem were such an infallible master at antiquity as that no man can pretend to have catched him tripping in any point of it, without dealing unchristianly with him. For my part I think it no more heresy to deny *Dutch* than *Italian* infallibilities. And I think myself the more innocent as to Spanhem, that I have irrefragably proved his mistake, so very irrefragably, that I am not afraid that either Spanhem or G[ilbert] R[ule] shall ever be able to answer my arguments. But

XLI.—2. I have "misrepresented his words out of which I endeavoured to make good my charge." Wherein? In saying that "Spanhem denieth Exorcists to have been in the third century, whereas he doth not mention Exorcists in that place, but only Ostiarios, Copiatas, Acolythos."

G[ilbert] R[ule], so far as I can guard against it, shall never have occasion to say that I deal unfairly with him; and therefore I will not say that he is altogether inexcusable in this, for perhaps he had only seen the first edition of Spanhem's "Epitome Isagogica ad Historiam Eccl. N. T.," which, as I remember, was printed anno 1675, in which edition there is indeed no mention of Exorcists. But then the same Spanhem did again publish the same book, with enlargements and some alterations, 1689, with a notable as well as new dedication, which you have word for word on the margin,[1] and it was from this latter edition that I transcribed these words—"Sed nec hujus ævi ordines minores quales Ostiariorum, Copiatarum, Acolythorum, Exorcistarum." If G[ilbert] R[ule] shall blame me for citing from the second edition of a book which had the author's second care, and by consequence is to be supposed to contain his riper and better pondered sentiments, I shall bear it as well as I can. But if "Exorcistarum" be not as really there as "Ostiariorum, Capiatarum, Acolythorum," I am content that G[ilbert] R[ule] sacrifice my name to perpetual infamy. But then, as I do not reckon G[ilbert] R[ule] altogether inexcusable in this matter, so neither can I allow it to be altogether excusable in him to have so rashly passed such an uncharitable sentence on me, viz. that I had "dealt unchristianly by Spanhem," when so very easy an enquiry, as it is to try if there be any second editions of a book, might have convinced him that I had done Spanhem nothing but justice. I wish this may be a caution to him for the future.

XLII.—Proceed we now to try if any more Presbyterian authors can be found who have made the like concessions. I ask the reader's allowance to take some pains this way. I am in a manner forced to do it for mine own vindication, for having named Chamier, Blondel, Salmasius, and the Provincial Assembly of London, I added an &c. And G[ilbert] R[ule] tells me, "he knows not what my &c. may

[1] Serenissimo potentissimoque principi ac Domino D. Guilielmo Dei gratia magnæ Britanniæ, Franciæ, Hiberniæque Regi, Fidei Defensori Pio, Clementi, Magnanimo, fœderatæ Belgicæ supremo Gubernatori, oppressæ Europæ Liberatori, ac Vindici Reni (humani?) generis; hæc ipso Regiæ unctionis et consecrationis die voto nuncupabat Fredericus Spanhemius.

contain in its vast belly."[1] I shall not enter into the philosophy of this profound question, whether it be essential to all &cs. to have *vast bellies*. Though, if it is not, I cannot see a reason why G[ilbert] R[ule] should have given a vast belly to my &c. for it was an &c. of my own making, and might not I have made its belly as lank as I pleased? But to the purpose:—Let G[ilbert] R[ule] take the following authors, who may for once satisfy &c.'s appetite, if it is not an arrant glutton. And

XLIII.—1. Let him take John Calvin himself, whom I know he is earnest to have a Presbyterian. This great author fairly allows proper Prelates, that is, Bishops with imparity of power as well as dignity—Bishops as far above Presbyters as the Roman Consuls were above the common senators, to have been in the Church ever since St Mark's time;[2] so he understands Jerom and subscribes to him.[3] And he frequently allows St Cyprian to have been a Bishop;[4] nay, he allows of Metropolitans in St Cyprian's time, with *power* over other Bishops.[5] And besides these concessions, which he has in the fourth book of his excellent institutions, he has a most remarkable passage to this purpose, in his notable discourse concerning the necessity of reforming the

[1] Sect. 11, p. 12.

[2] Quibus ergo docendi munus injunctum erat, eos omnes nominabant Presbyteros. Illi ex suo numero in singulis civitatibus unum eligebant, cui specialiter dabant titulum Episcopi: ne ex *Æqualitate*, ut fieri solet, dissidia nascerentur. Neque tamen sic honore et dignitate superior erat Episcopus ut dominium in collegas haberet; sed quas partes habet Consul in Senatu, ut referat de negotiis, sententias roget, consulendo, monendo, hortando, aliis præeat, auctoritate sua totam actionem regat, et quod decretum communi consilio fuerit, exequatur: id muneris sustinebat in Presbyterorum cætu. Atque idipsum pro temporum necessitate fuisse *humano consensu* introductum fatentur ipsi veteres (N.B. "*Humano consensu*," &c. Hæc enim verba (ipso Calvino teste, ut supra notatur, sect. V.) Episcopum illum de quo loquitur, merum Presbyterii moderatorem fuisse non patiuntur). Hæc Calv. Inst. lib. iv. cap. 4, sect. 2.

[3] Alibi tamen docet (Hieronymus) quam fuerit antiquum institutum: Dicit enim "Alexandriæ a Marco Evangelista usque ad Heraclam et Dionysium, Presbyteros semper unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu collocasse, quem Episcopum nominabant," &c. *Ibid.*

[4] *Vide* lib. iv. Instit. cap. 7, sect. 3, 21, 30; cap. 10, sect. 18; cap. 11, 6; cap. 12, sect. 6.

[5] Agnoscit enim Romanum Episcopum Stephanum Cypriani contemporaneum, adversus eos qui suæ provinciæ essent Episcopos jurisdictione præditum fuisse. Instit. lib. iv. cap. 7, sect. 7.

Church; for having most heartily insisted on and recommended the constitution of the Ecclesiastical government as it was in St Cyprian's time, he immediately subjoins to this purpose—"That if the Church, in his time, would agree to such an Episcopacy, no curses could be imagined which he should not think those worthy of, who should not submit to it with all reverence and dutiful obedience."[1]

XLIV.—2. Beza distinguishes three sorts of Episcopacy—the Divine, the Human, and the Satanical. The human he defines to be that which, from mere human prudence, and without warrant from the Word of God, was introduced into the Church, whereby a power was given to one pastor above his colleagues, yet bounded with canons for avoiding tyranny.[2] So that this human Bishop is quite another thing than a Presbyterian moderator; for such, as has been already observed, sect. V., he makes altogether necessary to the very being of a Presbytery. Now, this human Bishop he, in the most express terms, allows to have been in the Church in Ignatius's time,[3] that is, near to a century and a half before St Cyprian.

XLV.—3. Antonius Sadeel, another famous Presbyterian, in his answer to the repeated sophisms of Francis Turrain, the Jesuit, concerning the Church and the ordination of ministers, as well as Beza, more than once acknow-

[1] Talem nobis Hierarchiam si exhibeant, in qua sic eminеant Episcopi, ut Christo subesse non recusent: ut ab illo, tanquam unico capite, pendeant, et ad ipsum referantur; in qua sic inter se fraternam societatem colant, ut non alio nodo, quam ejus veritate, sint colligati: tum vero nullo non anathemate dignos fatear, si qui erunt qui non eam reverenter summaque obedientia observent. De Necess. Ref. Eccl. Genev. 1576, p. 100.

[2] Episcopatus humanus, *i. e.* ex sola hominum prudentia, præter expressum Dei verbum in ecclesiam introductus est—potestas quædam uni cuidam pastori supra suos collegas attributa, canonibus tamen certis seu regulis adversus tyrannidem definita. Inter Saraviæ Op. De Tripl. Episcopatu, p. 14.

[3] "Concludimus Episcopatum humanum non *ordinis* sed *superioritatis*" (nota quam diserte distinguat Episcopatum hunc inter et munus meri moderatoris) "humanitus fuisse introductum —— suntque de hoc Episcopatu accipienda quæcunque nondum invecto satanico Episcopatu, de Episcoporum sive πρωτώτων (ut loquitur Justinus) auctoritate apud Ignatium et alios vetustiores Scriptores habentur." *Ibid.* p. 45.

ledges Episcopacy to have been before St Cyprian,[1] nay, even in the days of Ignatius.[2]

XLVI.—Franciscus Junius, in his Animadversions on Bellarmin, Contr. 5, Lib. 1, Cap. 14, Not. 24,[3] is every whit as frank; for Bellarmin having adduced the testimonies of Ignatius, Irenæus, Tertullian (particularly citing the famous testimony—" Dandi quidem jus habet summus Sacerdos," &c. from Tertullian's book about Baptism, cap. 17), Junius answers, that " Tertullian is to be understood as speaking agreeably to the order received in his time; that human ordinance of Bishops above Presbyters being then in use." And the same Bellarmin having adduced the same testimonies again, to prove that of old a Bishop was more than a Roman Consul, &c., Junius (Not. 25,) returns the same answer.

XLVII.—4. The Centuriators of Madgeburg are as plain in their acknowledgments as any men. It is needless to insist on their concessions concerning the third century—they give enough in the second. They not only tell us that " the three orders of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons did then every where prevail," but likewise, in most plain terms, they say, " that it was in this (second) century that the

[1] " In Epistola (Cypriani, n.) ad Antonianum quam mihi objicis, nihil, dicit Cyprianus quod te juvit, cum enim ex *veteri instituto* eoque *humano* unius ecclesiæ unum esse Episcopum oporteret, Cyprianus ait perperam facere Novatianum schismaticum quod Episcopatum Romanum ambiret, &c." parte prima, p. 445, Edit. Morgiis, anno 1583. *Et ibid.* p. 507, " illic enim (n, de unitate ecclesiæ) Cyprianus schismaticos ac præsertim Novatianum perstringens, negat in " uno loco posse esse vel plures greges vel plures pastores," adeo ut damnandi essent schismatici qui ecclesias dividebant, et in iis ecclesiis quæ suum habebant Episcopum *ex ordine tum recepto* constitutum, ipsi Episcopatum usurpabant." Et parte secunda, p. 137. De Presbyteris Romanis Novatianum deserentibus, &c. hæc habet. Illic igitur describit Cyprianus eorum resipiscentiam qui a schismate ad ecclesiam redierant, quum agnoscerent unum Episcopum in ecclesia esse debere, ac propterea se Pseudo-Episcopo renunciare. Hoc autem *vetus* quidem fuit, at *humanum institutum* in remedium schismatis inventum, ut testatur Hieronymus.

[2] *Vide* partem secundam, p. 448.

[3] " —Hæc Tertullianus de modo ordinis Ecclesiastici pro ratione sui temporis enunciat; nam Divinæ institutioni jam diu per illud tempus ordo ille humanus accesserat. Et—" Negamus hoc sequi ex loco Pauli ——Alii loco (n, ex Irenæo, Tertulliano, &c. citati) ex humano institutione et observatione loquuntur, quæ tum obtinebat."

change of government was made, and that by human authority Episcopacy was introduced.[1]

XLVIII.—6. Gersomus Bucerus, a first rate advocate for Presbyterian government, has more than twenty times given his concessions. You have a few of them on the margin,[2] from his large book De Gubernatione Ecclesiæ.

XLIX.—7. Petrus Molinæus, in his letters to the learned Bishop Andrews, doth more than once confess that it was introduced, if not in, yet very shortly after, the days of the Apostles.[3] Nay,

[1] Circa hæc tempora eam in ecclesia mutationem cœpisse et Episcopatum non tam Divina institutione, quam humana auctoritate, propter bonum ordinem et ædificationem atque successionem, *gradu Presbyterio superiorem* haberi. Cent. ii. cap. 7, col. mihi 126.—[Col. 95, Ed. Basil. 1624.—E.]

[2] Επισκ. 29, p. 173. Testimoniis quibusdam, ex Sancti Cypriani epistolis citatis, ita subnectit. "Unde colligimus (inquit) quomadmodum Presbyteri in Ecclesiæ gubernatione, sine Episcopi auctoritate nihil agere poterant," &c. *Vide* plura huc spectantia, Επισκ. 78, p. 305, et p. 311, *agnoscit mutationem factam*, "post primum omniumque purissimum Christianisimi seculum." Et p. 315, "in amplioribus Ecclesiis Episcopalis προστασία acto decursoque Apostolorum ævo cæperit." Et p. 327. "Venio ad tertium seculum in quo Episcopi, cum in *Presbyterium*, tum in *Diocesin majori potestate* cœperunt uti." Et p. 343. "Loquuntur patres non de melioris temporis primo et antiquissimo seculo —— sed partim de secundo, partim de tertio seculo loquuntur, postquam Episcopi humano jure præfuerunt, aut etiam (ut in tertio seculo factum) ex auctoritate, cum in *Presbyterium* tum in *Diocesin* totam *plus Potestatis* adepti sunt." Et p. 344. "Cedo, num aliquis senserit Presbyteris baptismi administrationem ex Domini institutione et Apostolicæ ætatis usu illicitam fuisse? attamen postea, nisi Episcopi auctoritas accederet, consuetudine illicitam evadere cœpisse Tertullianus mihi auctor," "Dandi inquit baptismum habet jus summus Sacerdos," &c. Bucero igitur palam agnoscente, Tertulliani ævo, Episcopatus, cui non solum major dignitas sed et potestas adnexa, floruit.

[3] Scripsi librum de vocatione pastorum, in quo quædam sapientissimi Regis [Jacobi] animum pupugerunt, quasi adversa muneri Episcopali. Sed altrinsecus quidem nostrates non obscurè conqueruntur, me Episcoporum causam egisse, Aëriumque damnâsse, quod in re pridem et ubique recepta, ausus sit opponere sese consensui universalis Ecclesiæ; molesteque ferunt me dixisse jam inde a proximis successoribus Apostolorum passim receptum fuisse in Ecclesia, ut inter Presbyteros unius urbis unus aliquis emineret et Episcopus vocaretur. Epist. 1, inter Episcopi Wintoniensis Opuscula quædam posthuma. Edit. Lond. 1629, p. 161, 162. Et Epist. 2, *ibid.* p. 173. "Non sum tam fastidiosè arrogans, ut velim me opponere toti antiquitati; et rem quæ jam inde a seculo Apostolis proximo recepta fuit in Ecclesia, ut vitiosam aut improbam aspernari." Et Epist. 3, p. 179, se, in libro suo de muneri pastorali, p. 20, 21, in hunc modum ait scripsisse. "Statim post tempora Apostolorum, aut etiam eorum tempore, ut testatur historia Ecclesiastica, constitutum est, ut in

L.—8. Paul Baynes himself, one of G[ilbert] R[ule]'s singular men, in his Diocesan's Trial, is forced to acknowledge that there was Episcopacy in St Cyprian's time, in the person of Cornelius Bishop of Rome, p. 20: see more, 45 and 63; nay, before St Cyprian's time, in the Church of Alexandria, p. 44. I say he is forced, for indeed he does it most unwillingly. And

LI.—9. Mr Peregrin, his other singular man, tells us in his Letters-Patents, &c. that "in the age after the Apostles, custom had brought in a kind of Diocesan Bishops to preside in Synods, though in other respects they were reckoned amongst other Presbyters till about the year 195, (*i. e.* at least fifty years before St Cyprian was a clergyman), that Victor gave it higher advances."[1] Indeed, he so far owns it to have been in St Cyprian's time, that he most singularly cites Cyprian, representing the "growth of Episcopacy as a main cause of the wrath of God which appeared in the Decian persecution."[2] Nay, these are his very words[3]— "Thus while Diocesan Bishops were ordained to withstand divisions, on the contrary, they were increased thereby, as appeareth by the reasons which *Cyprian* and *Eusebius* give of the persecutions, and others about the Feast of Easter." Once more, endeavouring to shew how it was nothing strange that in the primitive times Episcopacy was not condemned, nay, that they were condemned as heretics who opposed it, he says, "that the hurt and wrong that Bishops do to Christ's Kingdom could not be so evident in the time of Cyprian and Athanasius, as it was since, or now is, even as the lion or leopard doth but little harm while it is but a little whelp."[4] These two singular authors I have cited out of pure reverence to G[ilbert] R[ule]'s recommendation. I return now to men of some more sense. In the next place, then,

una urbe unus inter cæteros Presbyteros Episcopus vocaretur, qui in suas Collegas haberet præeminentiam, ad vitandam confusionem, quæ ex *æqualitate* nascitur." Et p. 180, "nec sum usque adeo oris duri ut velim adversus illa veteris Ecclesiæ lumina, Ignatium, Polycarpum, Cyprianum, Augustinum, Chrysostomum, Basilium, Gregorium, Nyssenum, &c. Episcopos, ferre sententiam, ut adversus homines vitio creatos, vel usurpatores muneris illiciti." Nonne hic Ignatium Polycarpum, Cyprianum, ejusdem speciei cum Augustino, Chrysostomo, &c. Episcopos fuisse concedit? Immo vero, p. 184, agnoscit dignitatem Episcopalem ab ipsis Ecclesiæ incunabulis deduci posse.

[1] P. 18, 19. [2] P. 20. [3] P. 21. [4] P. 37.

LII.—10. Joannes Hen. Alstedius, in his Supplement to Chamier's Panstratia, allows Titus to have been Bishop of Crete, and the seven Apocalyptic Angels to have been singular persons, and in a proper sense Bishops[1]; Nay, that imparity got footing instantly after the decease of the Apostles, or rather in the times of the Apostles, and by their appointment.[2] And yet this author had zeal enough for Presbyterian government.

LIII.—11. Andreas Rivetus does also frankly acknowledge Episcopacy to have been in the days not only of Tertullian,[3] but also of Ignatius,[4] *i. e.* long before St Cyprian.

LIV.—12. Smectymnuus,[5] to avoid needless controversy, lays down three things as acknowledged—1. "That the first and best antiquity used the names of Bishops and Presbyters promiscuously. 2. That in process of time some one was honoured with the name of Bishop, and the rest were called Presbyters or Cleri. 3. That this was not *nomen inane*, but there was some kind of imparity between him and the rest of the Presbyters.[6] Now, is it not certain that before St Cyprian's time, the names were impropriated?

[1] Inter pastores fuerunt etiam quidam gradus: nam alii aliis fuerunt superiores, *v. g.* Titus fuit Episcopus Cretæ, adeoque aliis Episcopis præpositus. Et Episcopi septem Ecclesiarum in Apocalypsi, suos procul dubio *sub se* habuerunt Episcopos: patet itaque hos ordines admisisse suos gradus. Tom. 5, lib. 4. cap. 1. Edit. 1629.

[2] Sed quia inter Presbyteros alii aliis præfuerunt, ita nimirum ut in quolibet Collegio unus aliquis primarius Presbyter, sive Episcopus, sive pastor, nempe ordinis et regiminis causa fuerit constitutus, certum nobis esse debet. Statim post Apostolorum excessum cœpisse discrimen istud inter Episcopum et Presbyterum: discrimen dico non essentiale sed accidentale: nam Episcopus dicebatur qui Presbyteris pluribus præerat. Quid? res ipsa cœpit tempore Apostolorum vel ab ipsis profecta est Apostolis: Nam Paulus mandans Tito "UT OPPIDATIM PRESBYTEROS CONSTITUAT" ipsi quandam ἐπισκοπὴν super ipsos delegat, *ib.* sect. 14.

[3] Argumento a celebri illo Tertulliani testimonio, "Dandi jus habet," &c. deducto, respondens hæc habet. "Tertullianus de *humano ordine* jam suo tempore recepto loquitur, quo, ex omnibus unus ecclesiæ episcopis, probatus quisque senior, ut loquitur, in collegii presidem eligebatur, quem Episcopum specialiter appellabant." Cathol. Orth. Tract 2, quest. 22, sect. 3.

[4] De Ignatio, "quod autem Presbyteros subjicit Episcopis, sic intelligimus, non quod ii qui laborabant in doctrina, et duplici honore digni erant, cum Episcopis eundem ordinem non constituerint, sed quod *jam tum mos ille invalesceret* ut inter Presbyteros unus electus esset qui cæteris anteiret." *Ibid*, sect. 4.

[5] [*Vide infra*, p. 117, sect. 56.—E.]

[6] P. 21, edit. 1654.

Again, do not these five gentlemen subscribe to Jerome's opinion about the introduction of imparity?[1] And doth not he make it to have obtained in Alexandria ever since St Mark's time? Farther yet, do not they reason for the original identity of Bishops and Presbyters from this topic, that they do not find in Scripture any ordination to the office of a Bishop differing from the ordination of an elder?[2] And will it not follow by parity of reason, that so soon as there were different ordinations, there were different offices? Now, to imagine that they did not know that there were distinct ordinations for Bishops and Presbyters in St Cyprian's time, were to have but a very mean opinion of the learning of Smectymnuus. Once more, how often do they cite him for a pattern to Bishops?[3] Lastly, are they not forced, for finding a difference between the Bishops of the Cyprianic Age and the English Bishops, when they wrote, to have recourse to the sorry plea of the *sole power*, and affirm that the ancient Bishops did not, as the English, claim the *sole power* of ordination and jurisdiction?[4]

LV.—13. The publishers[5] of the "English Annotation," in their advertisement concerning the Notes on Phil. i. 1, and 1 Tim. iii. 1, and 1 Tim. v. 17, tell us, that "Bishops were set over Presbyters by a custom which, though very ancient, and near the Apostles' time, as Chamier truly acknowledgeth, hath for a long time far departed from the golden rule, the Word of God." Here, you see, Chamier's acknowledgment concerning the early introduction of Episcopacy, which you have above,[6] is very frankly approved. Again in that same advertisement, whereas the annotator on Phil. i. 1, had cited the Council of Nice for this, that there should be but one Bishop in a city; and Cornelius, reproaching Novatianus with the ignorance of such a common principle in the ecclesiastical government, the adversaries observe as follows:—"As to the Council of Nice, they, after a good deal of trifling, tell us, "if there was an express Canon to that purpose, it was so much younger

[1] P. 24.
[2] P. 18.
[3] See p. 18, 27, 29, 31, 32, 35, and Vindication, p. 10.
[4] *Vide* sect. 8 and 9.
[5] [Some of the Westminster Divines (n. Gataker, Gouge, Reading, Taylor, Featley) published their Annotations, which our author calls *English*, probably in order to distinguish them from some *Dutch* ones, which came out about the same time, A.D. 1645.—E.]
[6] Sect. 2 and 3.

than the antiquity alleged for the *parity*, or rather the *identity*, of Bishops and Presbyters, that as to the point in question, rightly stated, it makes nothing for the prelatic pre-eminence." From which it is plain that they do not only acknowledge a prelacy to have been in the Church in the time of the Council of Nice, but also that that Council, (which yet they reckon, though falsely, to have been anno 314), was very far posterior to all the evidences they could pretend to adduce for *parity*. This I take notice of because it is so clearly inconsistent with the accounts our Scottish Presbyterians have given of the novelty of Episcopacy.[1] But that which is most directly to our present purpose is, what they say concerning Cornelius and Novatianus; their words are—"And if Cornelius, a better man than his ambitious and fraudulent antagonist—for Novatianus was both—spake big words to uphold the *Prelacy* he stood for (it being in his own case, and in so hot a contestation) it is no matter either of marvel or of moment to maintain the *Prelacy* of Bishops either as agreeable to the Word of God, or the most pure and primitive antiquity, since Cornelius was contemporary with Cyprian in the third century," &c. Now all I am concerned for at present is (not to call them to an account for giving such harsh treatment to such a holy martyr as Cornelius, but) that I dare affirm, we have here a fair concession of Episcopacy in St Cyprian's time.

LVI.—14. The *Divines* at *Newport* in the *Isle of Wight* (Mr Marshal, the first of the five of which Smectymnuus was compounded, Mr Vines, Mr Caryll, and Mr Seaman, if we may believe the Synod of London in their "Vindication of Presbyterian Government," p. 125) who disputed with King Charles the First, in their First Paper given in to his Majesty, do make their concession thus—"We grant that not long after the Apostles' times, Bishops in *some superiority* to, (*ergo* not in *parity* with,) Presbyters, are, by the writers of these times, reported to have been in the Church." That is, as they explain themselves in their Second Paper,[2] "while the function was one, the names were not divided; when the function was divided, the name was divided also, and indeed impropriate." Which,

[1] *Vide supra*, cap. 1, sect. 9, &c.

[2] P. 223, Ed. Hague, 1651.

as I have often said, no man can deny to have been done before St Cyprian's time. In short, those Divines express their minds in the very terms of their master Salmasius, and so no doubt according to his meaning, whereof we have had enough already.[1]

LVII.—15. Ludovicus Capellus, in his "Theological Positions concerning the difference between a Bishop and a Presbyter,"[2] acknowledges this difference to have been made in the second century; and it is observable that he attempts to prove it by the Epistles of Ignatius, which, (though he will needs have them to be spurious, yet) he allows to have been extant in the days of Irenæus, who, for any thing G[ilbert] R[ule] can know to the contrary, was dead before St Cyprian was born.[3] Indeed it was no wonder that he ascribed the introduction of Episcopacy to the second century, considering that he owns Blondel and Salmasius for his masters in the controversy.[4]

LVIII.—Moyses Amiraldus, Capellus's colleague, proceeds upon the very same (that is Blondel's) principles, as is clear from Thes. Salmuur, Part III, Dispute 38, sect. 10, 14, 15, and 19, so that he may be reckoned another Presbyterian (for that he was zealous enough) who acknow-

[1] *Supra* sect. 26.

[2] Thes. Salmur. Part III. Disp. 22, sect. 16.—"Decedente primo collegii Presbytero, qui secundus erat in collegio illi succedebat, et secundo tertius, tertio quartus, sicque reliqui pro ordine cooptationis suæ in collegio. Atque hæc succedendi ratio mansit in ecclesia ad finem usque ferme secundi a Christo nato seculi, quo tempore ratio illa succedendi in munere, et regendi ecclesiam immutata fuit. Tum enim primus collegii factus est per reliquorum Presbyterorum electionem, et mox paulatim concessa est illi aliqua supra reliquos sym-presbyteros *potestas*." Hæc. sect. 16.

[3] "Nova enim illa institutio (γνωστικὴ τάξις, ab hac enim phrasi ab Ignatio usurpata argumentum ducit quo probet nuperam fuisse unius supra cæteros prælationem; quam solide alias fortassis dispiciendum) non est istic accipienda de solo Episcopi nomine quod tum demum cæperit tribui illi qui Presbyteris præponebatur, sed de *gradu et potestati* quam *præ* illis *et supra* eos per novellam illam institutionem habebat."—Sect. 22. Et paucis interjectis, hæc habet.—Sect. 24. "Ita fit manifestum novum ordinem de Presbyterorum in primi locum successione ab Apostolico diversum, novamque constitutionem de Episcopi in Presbyteros prærogativa et auctoritate factam esse, ut ex illo auctoris istius (n, Ignatii) testimonio constat post centesimum quinquagesimum a Christi Resurrectione et Spiritus Sancti Missione in Apostolos annum. Circa Irenæi tempora."

[4] *Vide* Initium. Disputationis.

ledges Episcopacy to have prevailed in the days of St Cyprian. So may also

LIX.—17. Albertinus, Blondel's colleague, who therefore reckons Ignatius's Epistles spurious, because so pat for Episcopal government; and yet withal he makes them to have been forged about the middle of the second century, "and to have been (unwarily, and without examination) received by the ancients for genuine."[1] Now with what reason he affirmed so is not the matter; it is enough that he fairly confesses Episcopacy to have obtained in the second century.

LX.—18. Samuel Bochartus, in his famous Epistle to Dr Morley, though he affirms that "Presbyters were before Bishops," yet is very confident that "Episcopacy was introduced very soon after the Apostles."[2]

LXI.—19. Joannes Hoornbeek, another faithful follower of Blondel and Salmasius, in his "Dissertation concerning Episcopacy," more than once expressly owns it to have been in St Cyprian's time; particularly, he says, "after that Bishops were become superior to Presbyters, by having some *power* over them, and the exercise of some ecclesiastical acts appropriated to them, yet it was not allowed them to deprive Presbyters of all power of government."[3] And having for this cited divers testimonies from St Cyprian, he concludes thus—"so that it is plain," says he, "that even after the difference and disparity between Bishops

[1] Circa medium secundi seculi compositæ sunt, ac incaute et absque examine a veteribus receptæ.—Albertinus De Eucharistia, p. 284, as cited by Dr Hammond against Dr Owen, cap. 2, sect. 1, n. 16.—[Hammond's Works, Lond, 1684, vol. 4, p. 8.—E.]

[2] Si de antiquitate res est, cum Hieronymo plane sentio, Apostolorum ætate, inter Episcopos et Presbyteros nihil fuisse discriminis, et communi Presbyterorum consilio ecclesias fuisse administratas: Itaque Presbyteri Episcopis omnino sunt antiquiores. Interim, Episcopale regimen esse antiquissimum, et paulo post Apostolos per universam ecclesiam magno cum fructu obtinuisse, est mihi compertissimum. Page 7.

[3] "Denique quamvis jam etiam *potestate* aliqua, sed ecclesiastica, et actuum quorundam ecclesiasticorum exercitio superiores Presbyteris essent Episcopi, attamen monebantur quoque ut ne Presbyteros a regimine ecclesiæ removerent, quod neque fecerunt optimi quique," p. 36; dein' multis Cypriani testimoniis per paginas 37, 38, 39, aspersis, tandem, p. 39. sic concludit—"Ita vel post constitutum in ecclesia discrimen et disparem inter Episcopum ac Presbyteros gradum, non tamen sanioris ac sanctioris animi Episcopi omnia ad se rapiebant et Presbyteros excludebant," &c.

and Presbyters was introduced, wise and holy Bishops did not entirely exclude Presbyters from all interest in the government;"[1] indeed he has many such concessions, as may be learned from the margin.[2]

LXII.—20. Joannes Dallæus, a man of singular diligence and erudition, and a zealous asserter of Presbytery, in his second book concerning Confirmation,[3] affirms that the "ceremonies of chrismation and imposition of hands after baptism, (which the Church of Rome calls the Sacrament of confirmation), were not introduced till the distinction was made between Bishops and Presbyters."[4] And yet he grants, in express terms, "that those ceremonies were in use (ante tertii seculi initia), before the beginning of the third century." Indeed, he fairly owns Episcopacy to have been in Tertullian's time, even before he wrote his book, "De Baptismo," for he understands that often men-

[1] "Quousque in primitiva ecclesia simplicissimus ordo viguit, ut, pro ætate et tempore adeptæ ordinationis, prior res ecclesiæ in collegarum et compresbyterorum seu coepiscoporum collegio moderatur, et huic decedenti sequens surrogaretur, isti iterum proximus, et sic deinceps, et ille quasi Primatus ordinis, uti dicunt, haberetur, nullo cujuspiam ambitu, sed successione naturali, quod durasse autumat Salmasius circa medium secundi seculi, Blondellus ad annum 136, in ecclesia Hierosolymitana, et in Romana, ad annum haud multum discrepantem, 140. Neque nominis neque ordinis aut superioris potestatis ulla fuit inter ecclesiæ præpositos differentia: sed ubi ratio illa succedendi vetus in *πρωτοστασίαν*, si qua et qualiscunque fuerit, desiit, ac ejus loco adhiberi cœpit electio quasi dignioris, quum non semper antiquior videretur dignissimus, hinc rerum ordo paulatim mutari et distinctum *πρωτάτου* nomen, tum et dignitas superior et *potestas* postmodum, jam hæc, tum illa, in aliis tandem maxima succrevit." P. 49, 50, *vide plura* p. 90.

Et in Epistola de Independentismo non solum Cyprianum ejusdem cum Augustino speciei concedit fuisse Episcopum—p. 16, 17, 18, sed etiam p. 87, 88, contra Independentes in hunc modum arguit. "Quis vero existimet, in civitatibus amplioribus, ubi in varios cœtus coire ecclesia necesse habuit, singulis cœtibus ubique fuisse suum singulare Presbyterium et unamquamque congregationem fuisse singularem ecclesiam, uti totidem ecclesiæ esse debuerint una in civitate, et synedria totidem, quot justi cœtus neque dependerint vel conjuncti fuerint cum aliis communi regimine? Potissimum si rationem habeamus civitatum et *ecclesiarium Episcopalium*. An putamus *Cyprianum*, quando Presbyterii sui facit honorificam toties mentionem, intellexisse tot congregationales in urbe et diocesi sua ecclesias et Presbyteria, quot forte erant ecclesiarum cœtus, et non potius Carthaginensis cleri consilium, et recturam in cœtus et ecclesias ad se spectantes? *Vide plura*, p. 90, 91.

[2] Cap. 2, p. 115, edit. Genevæ, 1659.

[3] Cap. 3, p. 113.

[4] Cap. 4, p. 149.

tioned testimony, " Dandi quidem jus habet," &c. as all mankind except G[ilbert] R[ule] have ever understood it, that is, as a clear evidence of the Episcopal anthority in the days of Tertullian. The same author makes every whit as full concessions in his books, in which he endeavours to prove the spuriousness of the works commonly attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite, and of Ignatius's epistles. In the first book, which is against the works attributed to Dionysius, he insists on this argument, that the author of those writings never so much as once calls those of the superior order Episcopi, Bishops but always ἱεραρχαι, Chief Priests; and he never calls those whom the Church, *a little after the Apostles* distinguished from the Bishops, and constituted in a *second order* Presbyters, the name commonly bestowed on them by all christians, but always ἱερέας, Priests;[1] and in the other book which is against the epistles of Ignatius, he makes it Palmarium Argumentum, a principal, a first rate argument against their being genuine, that the author so constantly distinguishes Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, as they were distinguished, and signified distinct orders in the third century.[2] Would you have more? He affirms in most plain terms, that it is *clearer than the mid-day sun*, from such of Origen's writings as are extant, and especially from St Cyprian's epistles, that in the third century, not only the offices and functions, but also the names of Bishop and Presbyter, were distinguished all the Roman world over.[3]

[1] Sed et quos Ecclesia *paulo post* Apostolos ab Episcopis distinxit et *secundi ordinis* fecit sacerdotes noster (*i. e.* pseudo Dionysius) eo, quo vulgo apud nostros (*i. e.* christianos) gaudebant, Presbyterorum nomine, nunquam quod meminerim, vocat, sed ἱερέας, sacrificos, perpetuo dicit. Lib. I. cap. 30, p. 171.

[2] Hic enim duo illa nomina (Episcopi et Presbyteri) plane eodem sensu accipit, quo a tertii seculi et sequentium christianis ad hæc usque tempora accepta fuisse et scimus, et libenter concedimus; sic nimirum ut duas dignitates a se invicem distinctas significent; Episcopusque is intelligatur qui Presbyter quidem ipse quoque est, sed et Presbyterio præest, et in eorum collegio caput est; Presbyter vero is sit, qui Episcopo subest: unde necessario exsurgunt tres in Ecclesia ministrorum *ordines*, Episcopus *primus et summus*, Presbyter *secundus et medius*, diaconus denique *tertius et infimus*. Lib. 2. cap. 26, p. 386.

[3] Tertii jam ad extrema vergentis seculi tempore —— pene ubique in orbe Romano, distincta fuisse, Episcopi et Presbyteri non tantum officia et munia, sed etiam nomina, et ex iis quæ supersunt Origenis, et ex Cypriani maxime epistolis, *sole meridiano clarius est*. Lib. 2, cap. 38, p. 462.

LXIII.—21. The anonymous author of the "Observations," "Dr Pearson's Vindication of Ignatius's Epistles," and Dr Beveregius his "Notes on the Apostolic Canons," as cited by Beveregius,[1] acknowledges that the distinction between Bishops and Presbyters was made towards the end of the second century.

LXIV.—22. Franciscus Turretinus, a late Genevian Divine of great reputation with our Scottish Presbyterians, doth also very plainly give us his concessions. He acknowledges Victor (who lived many years before St Cyprian), to have been Bishop of Rome.[2] But the things I would chiefly recommend to G[ilbert] R[ule's] consideration, are, that Turretin grants that Prelacy began to prevail very soon after the Apostles.[3] That he disputes only against the divine right of Episcopacy.[4] That against this divine right he takes an argument from Ignatius's epistles, which though he reckons spurious, yet he allows (following Salmasius), to have been forged about the year 150. That the force of this argument lies in Episcopacy's being called a new order, in one of those epistles,[5] that he assigns Jerome's "Toto Orbe Decretum est," (not to Jerome's own time, as G[ilbert] R[ule] does, but) to the year 150 (what moved him to give us the account in Blondel's very words almost, and yet to call it the year 150, when Blondel calls it 140, let the curious enquire.)[6] And lastly, that over again he ascribes the introduction of Episcopacy to the second century.

[1] Cod. Can. Eccles. Primitiv. Vind. L. 1, c. 1, sect. 6, p. 7.

[2] Inst. Theol. Elenct. part. 3, Loc. 18, qu. 20, sect. 4.

[3] —Non quæri de jure Ecclesiastico, quod arcessatur ex antiqua consuetudine, quæ non multis, post Apostolorum tempora cœpit invalescere, quod facile concedimus, qu. 21, sect. 4.

[4] Idem (n) [Presbyteris Episcopos non esse jure divino prælatos] patet ex epistolis Ignatio martyri falso adscriptis, nam auctor, quisquis ille sit, qui scripsit circa centesimum quinquagesimum annum Christi, in epistola ad Magnesios vocat πρεσβυτέριον et Ecclesiæ per illud administrationem Χριστοῦ νόμον Christi legem, quia ex institutione et voluntate Christi per Apostolos constituta est, at νεωτερικὴν τάξιν, novellam institutionem, quæ suo tempore Episcopum Presbyteris præponebat. *Ibid.* sect. 11.

[5] Non sequitur jam tum decretum esse toto orbe [nempe dum primum a Corinthis dictum "Ego sum Pauli," &c.] ut unus aliquis cæteris præponeretur, sed tum successu temporis, postquam alii passim Corinthiorum exemplo dementati, in partes discerpti sunt, quod ante annum Christi 150 contigisse probari non potest. *Ibid.* sect. 12.

[6] Si vero quæratur quando cœperit ista distinctio—— (deinde systemate Blondeliano de primo ordinatis breviter exposito, addit.)—"quæ suc-

LXV.—23. Melchior Leideckerus, an author cited by G[ilbert] R[ule], makes most plain concessions in that very same dissertation from which G[ilbert] R[ule] adduces a testimony which he thinks makes for him. Leidecker, I say, grants that in Tertullian's time, Presbyters could not baptize without the Bishop's authority.[1] He grants that the two orders of Bishops and Presbyters were distinguished, and that *more power* was conferred on the Bishops, so soon as (if not rather before) the names were appropriated,[2] referring the reader for farther satisfaction to Blondell, Salmasius, and Gersom Bucer, whose concessions I have already given in great enough plenty; nay, he fairly grants that Episcopacy had footing in Africa as early as Christianity itself, or at least, very soon after.[3]

LXVI.—But does not Leidecker say, "that Episcopacy in Africa was only a title of order and presidency?" Does he not say, "that the ancient liberty of the Presbytery was there retained, and that Bishops had only the honour of presidents, but no domination over either Church or Presbyters?" Has not G[ilbert] R[ule] cited him fairly in his "Cyprianic Bishop examined," sect. 9, pag. 11? They are indeed Leidecker's words which G[ilbert] R[ule] has given; but to give us a few of any author's words is one thing, and to give his real mind and sentiments is another; and every man of common sense will be convinced of this, who reads

cedendi ratio per aliquod tempus mansit donec mutata fuerit sub finem *secundo seculi;* tum enim primus synedrii factus est per reliquorum Presbyterorum electionem et concessa est illi *aliqua potestas* in Sympresbyteros quæ sensim per gradus crevit. *Ibid.* sect. 13.

[1] Baptizabat autem Episcopus — et Presbyteri etiam, imo Diaconus tempore Tertuliani non tamen absque Episcopi auctoritate quæ quandam missionem dabat, ut patet ex libro ejusdem de baptismo. Leidecker Dissert. de statu Eccl. Africanæ, sect. 5.

[2] At cum lapso tempore, unus ex ille ordine eligi cœpit, qui cæteris præponeretur *aucta* etiam *potestate,* is appellatus est solus Episcopus; cæteri vero Presbyteri nempe cum pares essent omnes, et in uno eodemque gradu consisterent, omnes, tam Episcopi, quam Presbyteri, promiscue et absque discrimine dicebantur: postquam autem ordinum inductum est discrimen, nominum quoque distinctio simul invecta est. *Ibid.* sect. 6.

[3] Discrimen hoc [Episcopum inter et Presbyterum] in Africa invectum est, quando Ecclesia ibi cœpit vel accrevit. Sic Tert. L. de Bapt. "Dandi Baptismi jus habet,"—— Neque adeo mirum est lapso tempore *potestatem Episcopalem* seu usurpatione seu adulatione accrevisse, ut ordo ab institutione primigenia plane degeneraverit. Eadem Dissertatione, sect. 2.

but that very page from which G[ilbert] R[ule] took his citation. In that same very page, I say, a very few lines before the words transcribed by G[ilbert] R[ule], Leidecker tells us, "that the city of Carthage was divided into parishes; each whereof had their own Presbyters and deacons, who were employed in the ministry, bnt did nothing in matters of discipline or government, without the Bishop's allowance—all those parishes being subject to him."[1] And immediately before the words cited by G[ilbert] R[ule], he thus, " Cæterum Episcoporum jura in Africanis Ecclesiis valde restricta erant, servatis antiquis Episcopatus legibus, atque adeo illis positi limites ne ministerio ad imperium abuterentur, aut Presbyteratus bonos quid detrimenti caperet," *i. e.*—" Nevertheless, in the African Churches, the rights of Bishops were much restricted—the ancient laws of Episcopacy being still retained; and they were so bonnded, that they might not transform that which was only a ministry into an absolute sovereignty, or that the honour of the Presbytery might suffer any detriment." And then follow the words cited by G[ilbert] R[ule].—" Namque ut, ab origine, Episcopatus ordinis, et præsidentiæ in Presbyterio titulus erat (quamvis alibi suos terminos egrederetur) in Africa vetus libertas Presbyterii retenta est, dum Episcopi præsidentium honore, non *Dominatu* in ecclesiam aut Presbyteros, gauderent," *i. e.*—" For as Episcopacy at first—was a title of order in a presidency (though elsewhere it transgressed its bounds, yet) in Africa, the ancient liberty of the Presbytery was preserved—the Bishops enjoying the honour of presidents, but without *domination* over either Church or Presbyters." And now let any man of common sense and common ingenuity lay all these things together, and then let him tell me, if there is any probability that Leidecker had the least intention to assert a parity between Bishops and Presbyters in the words cited by G[ilbert] R[ule], but it is not the first time that G[ilbert] R[ule] has suffered himself to be abused by a false notion of the word *(Dominatus.)*

[1] Nempe omnes regiones uni *suberant* Episcopo, et singulæ suos habebant presbyteros et diaconos; illi ministerio occupabantur, nihil tamen agentes in disciplina et regimine ecclesiastico, nisi cum Episcopi ipsius conscientia.

LXVII.—But Gilbert] R[ule] says, "that Leidecker not only asserteth what is contained in the testimony cited by him, but also proveth it by divers testimonies." He does so. He proves his point, whatever it was, by the authority of St Austin, citing Serm. 234. *de Tempore;* and by the Canons of such African Councils as Austin either was, or might have been present in. Now G[ilbert] R[ule] himself, in his "Good Old Way Defended,"[1] has told us, "that Episcopacy was past in its meridian in the world, a little before St Austin's time." If Leidecker is such an author as can cite such testimonies for proving parity in St Austin's time, I wish G[ilbert] R[ule] much joy of him; but if it was not possible for him to be so ridiculous, then let some others look to themselves; for there is something ridiculous in the matter some way or other. And so much for Leidecker.

LXVIII.—But is there never a Scottish Presbyterian that has confessed there was proper Prelacy in the days of St Cyprian? Yes, one I have found; the author of "The Case of Accommodation," &c. published anno 1671.—"In the second century," says he, "of the Church, this prostasia could be more easily discovered; yet seeing the better pattern of the more pure and ancient times doth hold out no such thing, but an Episcopal parity among the elders and overseers," &c.[2]; and "its (Episcopacy's) first setting up, as most acknowledged, was in the second century, in a simple protocathedria to the senior Presbyter. Shortly thereafter it turned to a prostasia given by election, and then still ascending, even under the discountenance and persecution of the heathen powers and people, it did, notwithstanding, what by wresting the elections in many places from the Presbyters, and what by usurping the power of ordination and censures, advance to a very high degree of Prelacy, as is abundantly confirmed by what may be gathered from the records of those times, and especially by good *Cyprian* his words to his Presbyters,—"a primordio," &c. whereby, as it were, in opposition to the then corrupt custom of other Bishops, he plainly insinuates his contrary resolutions."[3] Here, indeed, are divers things observable, particularly a gloss on St Cyprian's "A primordio," &c. which I had not thought on. But proceed we with our author. His adversary had objected, that those who separated from the Com-

[1] P. 83. [2] P. 25. [3] P. 28.

munion of ths Scottish Bishops, could not have lived in the Communion of the Christian Church in the time of the Council of Nice, and must certainly have separated from the whole Catholic Church in the days of the holy Bishop and Martyr Cyprian. What doth he answer to this? Doth he deny, that in St Cyprian's time there was proper Prelacy? No such matter: what then? plainly thus:—So far as at present I am concerned, "that in the times to which he (his adversary) refers," says he, "there was an Episcopacy well advanced in the Church, and constantly a corruption contracted in its government, and yet withal quietly comported with, I do not deny."[1]

LXIX.—Thus for filling, &c.'s *belly* (which was put after four) G[ilbert] R[ule] has already four times four, and twice four to boot. If these twenty-four are not enough to blunt its appetite, he may find more cramming for it, if he will be at the pains to consider.—

25. Martin Bucer, lib. 2, "De Regno Christi," cap. 12; and his book concerning "The Cure of Souls," in English, p. 380.

26. Hieronymus Zanchius in his Confession of Faith, cap. 25, Aphorisms 10, 11, and his Observations on the same Aphorisms, and on the Fourth Commandment, Question 2, Col. 732, 733.

27. Musculus, as cited by Gersom Bucer, p. 571.

28. Danæus, cited by the same Bucer, p. 560.

29. Bullingerus, cited ibid. p. 290.

30. Amandus Polanus, Syntag. lib. 7, cap. 11.

31. Catalogus Testium Veritatis, lib. 3, col. 129; edit. 1608.

32. Paræus, in Apolcalypsin, col. 79 et 115.[2]

33. Chemnitius, Exam. Con. Trident. Part II. p. 62.

34. Pezelius, "Refutat. Catechis. Jesuit.," where, p. 34, thus—"Constat enim inde usque ab Apostolorum temporibus receptum, fuisse ut singulis civitatibus, aut provinciis præficerentur Episcopi singuli. Neque unquam Episcopus aut Pastor unus præesse omnibus Ecclesiis particularibus, ac multo minus regere universam Ecclesiam Catholicam potuit." So that he not only makes Episcopacy very early, as we have seen Chamier, Moulin, and many others do,

[1] P. 76.

[2] [I cannot find the author's reference, but what he wishes to prove is fully established in pp. 638, 689, 729, 730. Ed. Frankfort, 1647.—E.]

but he likewise fairly shews that from Episcopacy to Popery there is no good consequence. But of this more afterward, viz. chapter ix. section 25.

35. Brightman on Revelations, ii. 1, p. 49. Edit. Leyd. 1616.

36. Mr Cartwright, as cited by Bancroft, in his "Survey of the Holy Discipline," p. 75, 78, 123, 384.

37. The author of a book from Scotland, cited ibid. p. 78.

38. Mr Robinson, cited ibid. p. 390.

39. Doctor Reynolds, cited ibid. p. 391.

40. Doctor Folk, ibid. p. 392.

41. Mr Sherewood, who wrote against Doctor Downam's Sermon, as cited by Downam in his Defence, lib. iii. p. 125, 135.

42. Mr Andrew Melvin, in his "Scoti τοῦ τύχοντος paraclesis," &c. against Daniel Tilen's "Parænesis," &c. cap. vi. sect. 3, 7, 17, and cap. vii. sect. 19, *imo passim*.

43. Didoclavius, or Calderwood, in "Altare Damascenum," p. 125, 126, 259, 302. If these two famous Scottish authors have at any time contradicted themselves, the best G[ilbert] R[ule] can make of it must be a confirmation of his own maxim, viz. that "contradictory assertions derogate from the authority of the assertor."

44. Mr Gillespie in his "English Popish Ceremonies."

45. Monsieur Gaches, cited by Dr Durel in his "View of Church Government," &c. p. 125.

46. Mons. Le Moyne, cited ibid. p. 130, 131.

47. Mons. De l'Angle, cited ibid. p. 143, 144.

48. Jacobus Lectius, cited ibid. p. 169, 170.

49. Doctor Porrèè, cited ibid. p. 299, 300.

50. Burmannus in his "System," printed at Geneva, 1678, vol. ii. lib. 8, cap. 13, sect. 6, says expressly, following his masters Blondel and Salmasius, that "Episcopacy was introduced jam altero, ut videtur, post Christum seculo."

51. Joannes Vander Waeyen, "Epistol. Apologet. adversus nuperas Frederici Spanhemii literas." See above, sect. 39, margin.

52. Mr Richard Baxter in his "Church History," chap. i. sect. 58.

53. "A Discourse, opening up the nature of Episcopacy as exercised in England," printed at London, 1661, p. 2, 3.

LXX.—Here are other twenty-nine, in all fifty-three, such a number, as I think, may for once dine a pretty vast bellied, &c. But if G[ilbert] R[ule] will have it so gluttonous to require more, I will hereafter disown it as none of my &c.'s, for I never intended to make monsters; and seeing G[ilbert] R[ule] has so stretched the belly of it, let him either provide food for it, or let it starve and die. It has already exhausted my small estate, for not one morsel more have I at present to bestow upon it—I mean I am not in a condition to give any more Presbyterian authors by retail: yet, now when I think on it, I think I can direct G[ilbert] R[ule] how to find well stored magazines—I can recommend to him in gross,

LXXI.—1. All the true and genuine disciples of the great modern masters—Beza, Chamier, Gersom Bucer, Blondel, Salmasius, &c. Now can any man pretend to be the sincere disciple of such masters if he shall adventure to contradict them in such concessions as I have shewn they have most plainly and unanimously made? And I am the more inclined to think I have good reason to recommend this to G[ilbert] R[ule]'s consideration, when I call to mind that many whom, I persuade myself, G[ilbert] R[ule] will readily own to have been great scholars (such as the Provincial Assembly of London, the Publishers of the English Annotations, Capellus, Amyraldus, Dallæus, Hornbeek, Turretin, Leidecker, &c.) have been so very careful not to recede from them. I may recommend to G[ilbert] R[ule]—

LXXII.—2. All who are, or can reasonably pretend to be, the genuine disciples of St Jerome; for not only do Calvin, Blondel, Salmasius, &c. acknowledge that Jerome allowed Episcopacy to have obtained before St Cyprian's time, but also nothing plainer in St Jerome's own writings, as were easy to prove if it were needful. And—

LXXIII.—3. If they have any regard to consequences, all who make Episcopal Government the mystery of iniquity, for if it is that mystery, it began to work in the days of the Apostles, very early in their days. It had begun before St Paul wrote his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, which, as I take it, was written fully fifty years before the death of St John. Now it may justly be deemed a mystery, an un-

fathomable mystery, if, having begun to work so early, it had yet made no imaginable progress before, nor in the days of St Cyprian. But how could it by that time have made any progress, if those who were then called Bishops had only the power of Moderators of Presbyteries?—only such a power as was as much of Divine right, of Divine institution, and Divine approbation, as Presbyteries, nay Churches themselves. What progress had the mystery of iniquity made (if Episcopacy was this mystery) when there was nothing of proper Prelacy to be found? What progress had it made so long as the Churches were still governed by Pastors (in the Presbyterian sense) acting in parity? The sum is this—

LXXIV.—That it was not the dignity or the pre-eminency of a Presbyterian Moderator, but real and proper Prelacy of power, which is confessed by all the authors cited to have obtained so early in the Church, is evident from that which has already been observed, and I do observe again, namely, "that the dignity or the pre-eminency of a Presbyterian Moderator, according to the Presbyterian principles, was from the beginning." But the Prelacy I have adduced so many authors acknowledging to have been in St Cyprian's time, if you will believe them, was only an human institution of ecclesiastical establishment after the days of the Apostles. Neither was the change which was so early made only from weekly, or monthly, or semestrial, or annual, to constant Moderators. No, the most inquisitive of all I have cited are very positive that *constant Moderators* were from the beginning. I have already shewn this concerning Blondel,[1] and Salmasius is every whit as plain as he;[2] so are Ludovicus Capellus,[3] Moyses Amyraldus,[4] Joannes Hornbeek,[5] Franciscus Turretinus, [6] in a word, all the faithful followers of Blondel and Salmasius, and reason too, for of either weekly, or monthly, or semestrial, or annual Moderators—of any kind of Moderators that did

[1] *Supra*, sect. XI.

[2] Walo Mess. p. 27, 28, 127, 145, 205, 206, 249, 273, 274, 287, et Apparat. ad libros de Primatu Papæ, p. 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 76, 91, 128, 130, 133.

[3] Thes. Salm. part 3, Disp. 22, sect. 13.

[4] Thes. Salm. part 3, Disp. 38, sect. 14, 19.

[5] Epist. de Episcopatu, p. 30 and 71, and De Independentismo, p. 103.

[6] Institut. Theol. Elenct. part 3, loc. 18, Qu. 21, sect. 13.

not brook the office *ad vitam vel culpam*, there is as profound a silence in Scripture, and the records of the first three centuries, as there is of Cardinals or Abbots, Franciscans or Carthusians. And now—

LXXV.—To conclude this long argument, taken from the concessions of the greatest advocates I have seen for Presbyterian government. From what hath been said, methinks the reader be sufficiently convinced of the rashness, or at least inconsistency, of all those Scottish proctors for parity whom I mentioned, Chap. I. from Sect. X. to XXVI., and particularly of G[ilbert] R[ule], especially in the whole design of his "Cyprianic Bishop Examined." May I not now call it a shrewd presumption against him, that he has so zealously attempted to maintain that which so many, and those unquestionably the greatest, the wisest, the learnedst advocates of his own party, did not think maintainable? What has G[ilbert] R[ule] to support him, or make it seem so much as probable that he could with any colour of reason, not barely forsake, but boldly contradict so many of his own best friends, and the ablest advocates for the cause he stands for? Has he reputation for skill in antiquity, for any kind of learning, for nimbleness at thinking, for dexterity at reasoning, for happiness at making new discoveries, for exactness at weighing consequences, for any faculty or any talent proper for a controvertist, to bear him through in such a clear opposition to so many of the greatest men of his own faction?—or had they not zeal enough for their cause?—or had they not eyes to see that it was no wise for their interest, or the service of their cause, to have made such concessions?—or rather, is it to be supposed, that they would have made such concessions, if plain evidence had not forced them to it?

LXXVI.—How advantageous had it been for their cause? How much for the credit of parity? How much for the honour, the venerableness, the preferableness of Presbyterian government, that it had been always the government of the Christian Church during the ages of her greatest purity, that is, during the ages of her greatest persecutions? —during those ages in which she had no countenance from civil authority? Certainly such an advantage could not but have been of mighty weight with all thinking men. How

great an argument had it been of the reasonableness of shaking off the yoke of Prelacy in so many Churches at the Reformation? How proper had it been for stopping the mouths of Papists, who are so earnest to improve the antiquity of Episcopal government into a mighty prejudice against such of the Reformed Churches as want it? When the Church did so much need to be reformed, who can deny that it had been one good rule of reformation to have reduced her government to that form which had been so carefully and so conscientiously preserved and stuck by through all the purest centuries? Yet such brightness of evidence, it seems, the authors whom I have cited have seen for Episcopacy's having obtained even in those centuries, as forced them to throw up such notorious advantages. In short,

LXXVII.—That Calvin, Beza, Sadeel, Junius, Bucer, Moulin, Alstedius, Rivetus, Smectymnuus, the Magdeburgenses, the Provincial Assembly of London, the Divines at Newport, the Publishers of the English Annotations, that Chamier, Blondel, Salmasius, Capellus, Amyraldus, Albertinus, Bochartus, Hornbeek, Dallæus, Turretinus, Leideckerus, &c. have made such concessions, is clear as light itself, clearer than the mid-day sun, as Daillè words it. It is every whit as clear that nothing but force of evidence can be presumed to have prevailed with them to make such concessions. And upon these two suppositions I dare reason the matter thus with G[ilbert] R[ule]; either that they had brighter evidence for the prevalency of Episcopacy in the Cyprianic Age than those I insisted on for it; or they had not. If they had, is not my cause so much the firmer, and the more impregnable, as having better arguments for it than any I produced? If they had not better evidences, then it was either the light of lesser evidences, or of the same, that forced them to make such concessions. If lesser evidence forced them to it, my cause has still proportionably the greater advantage, as being confirmed by greater evidence than that which seemed sufficient to so many adversaries to oblige them to make such concessions. If the very same evidences which I produced forced so many adversaries to make such concessions, then how great

SCOTTISH WOOD SOCIETY INSTITUTED AT EDINBURGH
9TH JUNE 1845